This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

A 409473

1837
ARTES VERITAS SCIENTIA
LIBRARY OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
E PLURIBUS UNUM
TUEBOR
SI QUAERIS PENINSULAM AMOENAM
CIRCUMSPICE

4!

BL
51
.S67

Truth and Reality

Truth and Reality

WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO RELIGION

112319

OR

A Plea for the Unity of the Spirit and the Unity of Life in all its Manifestations

BY JOHN SMYTH
M.A. (NEW ZEALAND), D.PHIL. (EDIN.)

"I take it for granted that till an idealistic (*i.e.* spiritualistic) view of the world can be sustained, any exposition of theism is but wasted labour."—WARD'S *Gifford Lectures*, Pref. vii.

WITH INTRODUCTORY NOTE
BY PROFESSOR R. FLINT, D.D.

EDINBURGH
T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET
1901

PRINTED BY

MORRISON AND GIBB LIMITED,

FOR

T. & T. CLARK, EDINBURGH.

LONDON: SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, HAMILTON, KENT, AND CO. LIMITED.

NEW YORK: CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS.

TORONTO: THE PUBLISHERS' SYNDICATE LIMITED.

TO THE

THREE WOMEN

AND THE

MEMORY OF ONE OTHER

WHO HAVE BEEN INFLUENTIAL IN SHAPING MY CAREER

THE LATE MRS. R. ERSKINE OF INVERCARGILL, NEW ZEALAND

MRS. J. A. MITCHELL OF THE SAME CITY

MY MOTHER AND MY WIFE

THIS WORK IS AFFECTIONATELY AND REVERENTLY

DEDICATED

INTRODUCTORY NOTE

I DO not think that the work of my friend Dr. Smyth stands in need of any introduction. On the contrary, it seems to me admirably adapted both as regards content and form—thought and style—to interest and profit not only all philosophical readers, but thoughtful and educated men in general. I have not felt free, however, to refuse Dr. Smyth's request that I should write a few prefatory lines to his thesis, as I am deeply convinced of the exceeding value of its central thought, and rejoice to see it set forth so comprehensively and effectively.

That thought is, of course, far from entirely original. Plato affirmed it when he said that it was "with the whole soul that one must go to the truth" (with due explanation he might have added, with the whole body also); and Christ still more directly and fully recognised it in His enunciation of the supreme law of the religious and moral life. In a merely general form it has often found expression. But that is far from sufficient. And, in fact, there is no great truth which has been

more neglected or violated in philosophy, religion, and the conduct of life in general, or with more disastrous effects.

To what other source, for example, can we so surely trace the various forms of religious sectarianism, or the narrowness and exclusiveness of ancient civilisations, or the defects, say, of Greco-Roman Epicureanism, Stoicism, Scepticism, and Mysticism, or early Christian asceticism, or medieval scholasticism, or Cartesian intellectualism, or the sentimentalism of the age of Rousseau, or the rationalism of the first or the naturalism of the second section of the nineteenth century? Are they not all exemplifications of the mischief produced by disregard and disruption of "the unity of the spirit and the unity of life in all its manifestations"? Or, to confine our view to British philosophy alone, has not its chief error been, throughout far the greater part of its history, the treating of the human mind as a something which could be analysed into "states," or sectioned into "faculties," in such a way that the whole life and manifestations of the spirit of man might be accounted for by mere aggregation and recomposition, apart from the self and self-activity without which those so-called states and faculties were inexplicable and meaningless?

Ferrier and Stirling, Fraser, Laurie, Pringle Pattison, and others, have happily, to a very large extent, at least so far as Scottish teaching is concerned, effected in that respect a great philosophical reform.

It is nevertheless still most desirable that the truth which was so overlooked as to make the procedure referred to possible should be set in a clear light and presented in a style intelligible to all who have any philosophical affinities. A translation of the admirable work of Professor Eucken —*Der Kampf um einen geistigen Lebensinhalt*, 1896—to which Dr. Smyth duly acknowledges his indebtedness — would not, in my opinion, serve the special purpose to which I refer, just because it is so well adapted to the instruction of a strictly philosophical public. Dr. Smyth's work may be easily understood by almost all classes of educated persons, and may in consequence prove of use even to that considerable body of philosophers who never see that they have been in error until after the general public has perceived it. I observe with regret that there are such philosophers even in Germany, especially among those who occupy themselves in religious speculation. During the four years which have elapsed since Dr. Eucken's work appeared, I have met with a number of what were meant to be contributions to the philosophy of religion from German authors, which would never have been written if due attention had been paid to the book of Dr. Eucken.

Dr. Smyth certainly suggests a great deal more than he proves. But no intelligent critic will treat that as a fault. It is inseparable from the very nature of his work, which is a thesis, not an

elaborate treatise. Very rarely, I am persuaded, will his lines of indication and suggestion be found other than clear, true, and instructive. And that is all that can be reasonably expected.

He has done well to enforce so plainly and vigorously that the mission of man is work; true thought, either thought subsidiary to work or a form of work itself; and true philosophy no unpractical thing, but the ally of all real and high life both for the individual and for society.

I would venture to conclude by expressing the hope that one who has so worthy an ideal of what philosophy should be, may himself have the glorious privilege of contributing to its realisation, and seeing the upspringing of a true and healthy, free and spiritual philosophy, in what are, perhaps, the fairest of all the lands in which the English language is spoken and the "Queen's writ runs."

R. FLINT.

54 CRAIGMILLAR PARK, EDINBURGH,
19*th* *November* 1900.

PREFACE

A MAN'S deepest views on any subject at any one time indicate the progress he has made, and how deep is his insight into the inner relations and everlasting roots of the great facts of Life. In his earlier progress the flashes of revelation, illuminating at times whole realms of man's activity, which burst in on his eager spirit, have been shared by all earnest fellow-workers in his field; hence, however glorious and wonderful they are to his vision, the communication of them may be of no help to his neighbours. It is only when he has reached a point of vantage ahead of many of his fellows, and has seen further light indicating the further pathway, that it is laid upon him as a duty to speak a word of counsel and direction to those toiling behind. *When* a man should so speak, is no easy question to answer; it may be that, when he thinks he is in the vanguard, he is still only with the main body. When, however, his reading and intercourse with experienced and thoughtful friends convince him that he has a message to

deliver, he should give it forth with no uncertain sound, believing that what has furnished enlightenment and guidance to his Spirit, will cheer and encourage toiling souls elsewhere, and that no truth of the Living God can return unto Him void.

The writer of the present work trusts that he may not be found behind his age; ahead of it he well knows he is not. He does not claim to state anything original: he will not quarrel with the critic who declares that he has merely taken the views of many thinkers, and has woven them into a unity, in some degree at least appropriate to the needs and demands of the present. He claims merely the right to think for himself, merely the right to point out the insufficiency of some of the answers which have been loudly proclaimed as satisfying the deepest questionings, and therefore as comprehending the most fundamental facts, of the human soul, merely the right to point out how only he considers an adequate and satisfactory solution of these can be given, and merely the right to indicate how pressing is the need, so to re-define many of the most important terms of Modern Philosophy that neither definition nor usage may be contradicted by the great facts of Life.

The writer's main aim is to point out that the roots of Philosophy and of Religion, as of Morality and of Natural Science, lie in the constitution of the Human Spirit; and that, therefore, their questionings, methods, inquiries, and results, are

as much a process of Reason as is Logic itself, and that their basis and objects belong truly to the constitution of things, if anything does. In the very capacity to frame a denial to this position, lies, for the writer, the self-contradiction which assures him he has grasped the truth. Whether he speaks a word in season or not, is now left to the decision of the readers—the final tribunal to which, sooner or later, all writers must bow.

A preface, it has been said, should make known how the book came to be. The immediate cause of the being of this work was the desire of the writer to gain the D.Phil. degree of the University of Edinburgh. In spite of the immaturity of the views, it was deemed by the examiners worthy of the coveted honour, and, by several of the professors, worthy of the wider honour of publication. It is not possible, were it necessary, here and now to lay bare the development of the writer's Spirit, or to unfold the gradual growth of his convictions. Were he to name all the thinkers and friends to whom he is indebted, the list must include all the writers and teachers who have stimulated and furthered his development. All the important works he has read, have coloured his views; all the earnest preachers and speakers he has heard, have given him ideas; all the noble people whom he has been privileged to know, have widened and deepened his experience. He feels bound, however, to name those great teachers whose writings and thoughts enabled him to systematise

his own views: Professor Max Müller, Professor R. Eucken of Jena, Professor A. Seth, and Professor Flint.

In conclusion, he wishes to express his indebtedness to Professor A. Seth Pringle Pattison for all the help he has given in connection with the publication of the work; and also to his friend, W. Newlands, Esq., M.A., B.Sc., for so generously undertaking to correct the proofs for him—a matter which the writer was prevented, by a hurried return to this Colony, from doing himself.

DUNEDIN, NEW ZEALAND,
Autumn, 1900.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I.

PHILOSOPHY AND PHILOSOPHIC THEORIES.

		PAGE
Sec. I.	Introductory Words	1
,, II.	The Presuppositions, Procedure, and Results of a Satisfactory Theory	6
,, III.	Naturalism	13
,, IV.	Idealistic Theories which are Erroneous or Defective	29
,, V.	The Final Verdict	38

CHAPTER II.

THE TRUE VIEW OF THE SPIRIT OF MAN AND OF REALITY.

Introduction		41
Sec. I.	The Place of the Ideals in the Life	43
,, II.	On the Absolute Ideals and on Needs	50
,, III.	The Freedom and Self-Origination of the Spirit	61
,, IV.	Reality	72
	Preliminary View	72
	Reality is Spiritual	77
	Reality of Evil	90
	The Ultimate Reality	95

CHAPTER III

THE GIVEN. EXPERIENCE. FACT. TRUTH. REASON.

PAGE

Sec. I. The Given. Experience and Fact 97
a. The Given—
Forms of the Given 98
Existence of the Given 104
How the Given is known 106
The Ultimate Nature of the Given . 110
A Final Word 111
b. Experience. 114
c. Fact 122

Sec. II. Truth 125
What is Truth 125
Science 135
Philosophy 142
Criteria of Truth 146
Truth and Morality 152
Truth as Absolute and Eternal 158

Sec. III. Reason 161
Necessity for a New Definition of 161
Place and Function of Reason 163
Its Relation to Feeling 172
Its Relation to Authority 177
Its Relation to Intuition 182

CHAPTER IV.

RELIGION IS A MANIFESTATION OF THE SPIRIT.

Sec. I. Introductory Considerations 190
,, II. Religion and the Tests of a Spiritual Manifestation 202
First Test: Religion has a distinct Office in Life 204
Second Test: It must manifest the Spirit as a whole 208

PAGE

Third Test: It must have a Spiritual Experience of its own 209
Fourth Test: It must have Vital Connections with all Spiritual Manifestations . . 212
Fifth Test: It must be a Universal Manifestation of the Spirit 225
Sixth Test: It must display a Rational Advance 229
Seventh Test: It must exhibit varying forms. 232

Sec. III. Concluding Remarks 237
1. Religion and Intuition 237
2. Religion and Theology 242
3. Final Words 243

TRUTH AND REALITY

CHAPTER I.

PHILOSOPHY AND PHILOSOPHIC THEORIES.

SEC. I. INTRODUCTORY WORDS.

TRY as we may, we cannot escape Philosophy; the criticism which aims at the exhibition of the Unity of Life through all its manifestations, is as necessary to man's Progress and as necessary to his Life, as is the exercise of any particular faculty or the work of any particular science. It gives the rounded whole of Life, and is the final work of that Reason which, being an element, or rather a form of the activity of the Spirit in its manifestations, is present in all, and is ever, through an immanent criticism, enabling man to see in each of his spheres of activity the goal of his endeavours and the progress he has made and is making. We are philosophers, artists, lawgivers, and moralists at one and the same moment. Morality so encompasses our whole Life that no act

is free from a moral choice and decision; Reason—give it what definition we may—is in every movement of our thought, in every act of Life; the Spirit of man as Cognition, Feeling, and Will—as Reason, Desire, and Action—is in every act whatsoever; so that our daily Life and Work is a continual revelation of the hidden depths of our Spirit. Whether he know it or not, everyone in speaking of Truth in any domain is disclosing his philosophy, or what in the final issue he considers Truth and Reality to be, or is giving the basis to a philosophy which alone can account for Truth and Reality—a basis, it may be, opposed to the school of philosophy to which he thinks he belongs.

It may be argued that the schoolmaster who demands from the youthful culprit the truth of the matter, has no ultimate problem in view, and that the fulfilment of his demand has no bearing on the rest of his Life or on his ultimate view of things; it may be advanced as a tenable position, that the scientist engaged in classifying a plant has no other end in view than to find its right place in a natural classification, and that the question, as to whether he has attained Truth in the matter or not, has no connection with his views on any subject whatsoever; it may be further contended that the scientific inquirer deep in the mysteries of things, engaged in problems respecting the nature of the atoms, the simplification of the elements, or the unification of the various forms of energy, has no

other object in view than to find truth in the given case, and that this truth, when found, is something apart from and altogether different from his beliefs on other subjects and his opinion or non-opinion as to what in the final issue Reality must be. In the three cases cited, with what else has the narrator or inquirer to do than the relevant facts? The searching and thorough examination which the answering of this question demands, brings to light the vital connection between Truth and Reality, and the impossibility of separating a man's Life into so many compartments, in each of which a man may sit a distinct and different individual, holding isolated and separate views on Truth, Reality, Goodness, and Responsibility. Life is found to be one; and the only possibility of possessing Truth at all lies in the acknowledgment of a Reality which will give unity and harmony to all the various manifestations of Life. Let us here briefly indicate how a very cursory examination supports this view. Our further inquiry will fully substantiate it.

When the schoolmaster insists that the truth shall be told, he has before his mind a certain Ideal of Truth, and he feels bound by a moral obligation to see that the sacredness of this Ideal is not violated; he believes, too, that the same ideal imposes the same obligation on the child; and his whole treatment of the wrong-doer: the manner in which he will elicit the information, his enforcement of the obligation of truth-speaking, and the punishment meted out for the offence, will depend on his accus-

tomed mode of viewing this and such Ideals, and whether he deems the obligation of obeying them is absolute or relative. On the same basis will depend his judgments on his own work and that of others, the social duties which he recognises and observes, and every activity of thought or action put forth in the ordinary course of Life. His treatment of the child, like every other act of his life, reveals what at bottom he thinks and is. If the scientific classifier reflect, he will find that he, too, is under bondage to an Ideal, and so willing a bond-servant is he, that he will hazard life itself, if thereby he may satisfy his fair but imperious mistress. The scheme of classification itself is an Ideal not yet realised, the rules which its realisation imposes are Ideals never wholly attained, and his whole life-long endeavour is to embody in lists of interrelated Divisions, Classes, Orders, Genera, and Species, with appropriate nomenclature and significant Terminology, that vision of the realm of plants which inspires his every effort in the cause of scientific Truth. To him, also, obedience to his Ideal involves acknowledgment of an Ought, which is distinct from, and authoritative over, the Is and the Self. Nor is the scientific inquirer into the nature and causal connections of the material universe less bound to an Ideal. Before him floats the idea of a unity not yet attained, but which he must believe is attainable. To attain it he must deny himself, lay aside every weight and whatever will interfere with his progress; he

must keep guard against error and fallacy; he must watch through long lonely vigils, and toil on even when hope fainteth and the heart is sick. Whether he be conscious of it or not, in the obedient service of his sovereign he will learn lessons of humility, patience, tolerance, single-mindedness, and unselfishness. Truth, he will find, is not to be separated from Morality—the Ideal ever imposes on him the obligation to act in a particular way, ever calls for a moral choice and decision; so-called Intellectual Research is not to be separated from Life and from Character. A man in his acts is ever revealing himself. Both of the scientific workers, if they find a satisfactory solution, must answer the Riddle of Life and co-ordinate their own sphere with all other spheres of activity, so as to give full significance to the nature of the Ideals and their rightful place in the Life of man.

Truth, in the final issue, is the correspondence between a man's attainments and the Ideal aimed at, or rather with Ultimate Reality itself; the search for it is the endeavour to make the Is realise the Ought; it is the attempt to make the Character, the activities, and expressions of a man's Spirit embody and reveal the ends of that Spirit. This is the view I shall support throughout this essay. As to what that correspondence implies, and how it is attained, the sequel will show. We have seen that its attainment, even in the simplest instance we can think of, involves a moral obligation, so that Truth can never be dissociated from Morality.

No man then can answer the question: What is Truth? without considering the nature of moral obligation; and this at once leads him to ask: Why am I bound to follow these Ideals? What is the ultimate explanation of things which gives them their authority over me? Thus it is, that a man's view of Truth is based on his conviction of the ultimate Ground of All That Is.

SEC. II. THE PRESUPPOSITIONS, PROCEDURE, AND RESULTS OF A SATISFACTORY ANSWER.

Our object is not to get an answer to the question: What is the Truth of the matter in any given case? but, What is Truth in any and every case? We wish to know what is meant by Absolute Truth, and how man can be sure he has gained Absolute Truth. Now beginning, as we must, with Knowledge as it is, with Life as it is, we can, in order to reach our object, proceed only by an immanent criticism. We cannot abstract ourselves from the traditional Knowledge, and criticise it with weapons and methods not borrowed or derived from itself. We must take the common and scientific Knowledge of the day, and ask: What presuppositions are necessary in order that there be common Knowledge at all, and what conditions are necessary in order that there be common terms by which to express our common judgments? But our task is not yet ended. For as there can be no Knowledge apart from the activity of Thought or Spirit,

and, as we have seen, there is no Truth apart from a moral obligation to think and act in a particular way, we have to take into account the presuppositions, pre-conditions, and pre-agencies which make Action and a Moral Judgment possible. Here our search has borne us into the very centre of Life itself. But even here we cannot rest. For Life is ever expressing itself through its activities in outward acts and in the visible institutions of Society. Out into the stream of history we are now carried, and as we are borne onward adown the swelling stream of man's so-called Evolution, noting, as we must, how the activities of man grow and become differentiated, how nations rise and fall, how progress and retrogression alternate in bewildering succession, we have to ask: What must be presupposed to make all this possible? What root or source or spirit must be ascribed to man that will account for this alternating rise and fall; this mingling good and evil, truth and error; and this strange evolution, which makes some wonder if progress anywhere or of any kind has been made? We have now pursued our question up to the centre of Life, and then out to all its outward manifestations. There remains only the final question: What do the presuppositions in Knowledge, Action, and History all involve and imply? What ultimate view of things will alone give them Reality, and will fully account for them? That these presuppositions must be real, follows from the fact that Knowledge aims at Truth, and from

the belief that Life is the manifestation of the Real. In a word, our procedure asserts this: Here is Life, Life in the individual, Life in History; what root or source can be given to Life so as to make all its manifestations, activities, successes, and failures explicable?

If the objection be here urged: Your presuppositions are: Life is real or aims at attaining the Real, and we must accept the distinctions which men have always made between the true and the false, the good and the bad, etc.; but these are what you should prove and establish; I must answer: If it be affirmed that Life is unreal, how can there be any other proof to the contrary unless by pointing out that the speaker is self-contradictory? Were there no positive, how could there be a negative? Were Life all Unreality, how could the speaker be there at all to know it? Only a real thinker can declare unreality of anything. Every theory of Ultimates sets out with the same presuppositions, but, in forming the basis of their theory, many of them take only a part of Life as real—its manifestation known as Natural Science, or Reason as apart from Feeling and Will, or Thought as apart from Work—and so, as we shall see later, land themselves in insoluble contradictions and awkward dilemmas. My contention is for Life as a Whole. Concerning the other part of the objection—the acceptance of the above-mentioned distinctions—it follows as a corollary from the other presupposition. Let it not be supposed, however, that everything

in Life is taken for granted, and that there is to be no criticism and no questioning. Our whole procedure is a criticism; we desire Life so to criticise itself that we shall know what Reality and Truth are, and how they are to be found and known; that we shall have full and adequate conceptions of Work, Duty, and Progress given us; that we shall understand how the individual is vitally linked to society, and the present organically united to the past; that we shall be able to test all manifestations and activities of Life as they express themselves in living act and word and social institution; and that we shall be able to understand, appreciate, and use the distinctions which have ever separated one course of conduct from another, and to enter into the work of the present, convinced that we are the successors of a whole army of toilers, and that our labour is not in vain.

We shall expect that the result of our inquiry will enable us to resolve the contradictions which meet us in present-day thought and action, or if not to resolve, then satisfactorily to account for them, and to indicate the direction in which a solution can be found. Among such contradictions we may note the following:—

We are the products of the past and of our environment. Yet "we hold with Kant that our personality is superior to all social relations."

It is believed that Naturalism can explain all things. Yet we hold along with this, that

Humanity has all its rights preserved, and that the Universe is rational.

It is held with Pessimism that the Universe is shrouded in darkness and is the home of Unreason. Yet many believe with Pantheism that it is the manifestation of God.

The individual is the real unit of Society; Humanity is an abstraction; the only moral code is Hedonism, and the only political one is Individualism. Yet this school is forced by the pressure of facts to acknowledge, and to account for, Altruism, and can do so only by making it a growth of Selfishness; while, in the political and moral arenas, its cries are met by Associationism and the Happiness of the Greatest Number.

It is held that mere culture cannot answer the riddles of existence, or give any satisfaction to the deepest needs of man; hence the Agnosticism of the day. Although no adequate explanation is given of these "needs," or of "dissatisfaction" as here used, or "riddles of existence," it is contended that beyond Culture man cannot go. It gives the final answer, yet man is *conscious* the *final* answer does not *satisfy*; in other words, he knows that the *final* answer is *not* the *final*.

History and Society are compelled to acknowledge the worth of Ideal Ends and Values, as: Courage, Temperance, Justice, Toleration. Yet it is forbidden to give a Theory of Life, which alone can give the rightful place to these Ideals.

The age is given over to Determinism. Yet

in Practical Politics there is no doubt of man's freedom.[1]

Religion is explained as a temporary expedient produced by man's fear; or, by another school, as a product of man's fancies and desires. Many schools of Naturalism think they can give a satisfactory account of the rise and growth of Religion. Yet, in spite of all these so-called revelations of the Truth, competent judges declare the age to be distinctly religious, and that the tendency is to a deeper "religiousness."

Within Religion itself we have the movement towards greater elaborateness in rites and ceremonies. Yet just as marked is the growing strength of the belief, that "God is a Spirit, and they who worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth."

An antagonism is sometimes set up between Head and Heart, Reason and Feeling. In other quarters it is between Reason and Authority, and in others, between Reason and Faith. All these writers introduce a dualism in Life itself and in the Spirit of man; yet their writings show they believe in the Unity of Self-consciousness.

In Philosophy we have still the warring sects of Idealism and Realism; Spiritualism and Naturalism; Rationalism and Empiricism.

If it be asked: What is the criterion of Absolute Truth? What is the test of a theory which deals

[1] For the statement of these first seven I am mostly indebted to Professor Eucken's *Der Kampf um einen Geistigen Lebensinhalt.*

with Ultimates? we can answer by asking this other: What is the criterion of Truth anywhere? Is it not: Complete consistency and inner harmony, and a full accounting for every fact involved? In an Ultimate Theory every fact must be embraced and find its place; no explanation must be accepted which is an explaining away. There must be neither a veiling of the sorrow and evil of Life, as is always jauntily done by a shallow optimism, nor an obscuring of the moral ideals and moral greatness of Life, as is blindly done by Pessimism. Thought and Action must not be divorced; one side of our nature must not be made the province of Reason, and the other, without reason handed over to Unreason. Whatever is of moment to Life must be accounted for. If Religion has been a manifestation in the Life of man since the dawn of History, and an indispensable aid or agent or element in his progress, it must have a natural and no mere artificial place assigned to it. Reason, Feeling, and Will cannot be in antagonism, if terms are to be used consistently. Life grounded on an absolute foundation, so that Faith may be assured, and Reason have its presuppositions and necessary laws secured; so that Natural Science may not rest in doubt as to its basis, nor Morality wither at the root through the loss of its Ideals; so that Art, Literature, and every normal activity of man may rejoice in their mission, and the whole man have faith in himself, faith in his work, a clear view of his end, and a sense both of his own weakness and of his

own possible greatness; and so that the glory as of an ineffable presence which haunts him at times may not be dimmed to him, nor the power be taken from him of attaining the topmost heights of his being,—all this will surely be the result of a true answer to our questions.

In short, what an inquiry demands as its only satisfactory conclusion, is a complete and consistent definition of man's Life or Reason or Spirit—a definition which will not take for granted that plant life, animal life, and human Life are one and the same, or, going further afield, will not pretend to identify these with matter as known to the Natural Scientist; but which, after surveying all the facts, will faithfully affirm *what must be in order that all these can be,* and so will give an adequate explanation of all. That the time is ripe for such a definition, recent literature furnishes abundant proofs.

I cannot hope to be altogether successful, where so many distinguished labourers have failed or have been only in part rewarded; but at anyrate I hope I have not blinded my eyes to the difficulties which await my task, nor prejudged my inquiry by a one-sided view of facts. The presuppositions I have laid down or used implicitly, prejudge only by an all-sided view; their justification must be looked for in the inquiry itself.

SEC. III. NATURALISM.

The two great classes of Philosophic Theories. Since the dawn of speculation two groups of theories

have opposed each other, each contending it held the key to the solution of all mystery, or at anyrate to the solution of all ultimate questions. Using modern phraseology, we may call these opposing forces the schools of Naturalism and those of Spiritualism. The first of these denies to man a Spiritual Life rooted in an Absolute Spirit, under the government of Absolute Ideals, and possessed of freedom so that he can either obey or disobey. For it, the ultimate test of Truth and Reality is not something over man, but something on a level with man, not the Ought but the Is, not the Ideal but the Given; not the Spirit but Matter or Sense-impressions gives the key to Life's meaning and furnishes the test of Truth. What our senses tell us, that we must receive, what man has done we must believe; the outward, the seen, and the realised, we must rest on. Deeper we cannot go, higher we cannot reach. We must have done with dreams and fancies, longings and aspirations, needs and ideals, and we must rest on sober fact and plain reality. Even if Religion, Morality, and Art have to go by the board, we must accept the final decisions of Truth. So have spoken the schools of Naturalism in all ages. The opposing schools have ever been as eager to base their positions on "sober fact" and "plain reality." They have, however, contended that neither Truth nor Reality can be known or understood by man, if he denies that in himself there is a Spirit guided into Truth and towards Reality by Absolute Ideals. Not in the outer but in the inner,

not in the material but the spiritual, not in the Is and the Realised but the Ought and the Not-Yet-Realised, is the test of Truth to be found. We cannot understand what man has done or what he is doing, if we cannot sympathetically appreciate the Ideals striven for. It is not only Religion, Art, and Morality which must go by the board, if a Spiritual Life rooted in the Absolute be denied man; but Natural Science, Knowledge, and Truth. There will be no guide to Goodness, Beauty, or Truth; and Life will have neither meaning nor content. Life, to be possible at all, to be what we must accept it to be, if even speech and intercourse are to be possible, must have a spiritual basis. Such has been the proclamation of the schools of Spiritualism. I shall now in brief space prove that only on a spiritualistic basis can Life be interpreted, and that, therefore, Naturalism ever contradicts itself, or begs the question, or refuses to give their full significance to the facts of Life. I shall then show that certain forms of spiritualistic theories do not give a right content to the Spirit of man; and that, as the Spirit of man progresses from age to age, a new and enlarged interpretation is demanded by every fresh growth. In this way I shall prepare for what I deem a right conception of Life for the present age.

The Theories of Naturalism—Reality is the Given. The three main forms of Naturalism are: Materialism, which asserts that the All has been evolved from Matter; Dynamism, which asserts the All

has arisen by the workings of blind Force; Psychologism, which asserts that the mind of man and all its objects of knowledge are resolvable into sense impressions, and that from these by fixed law all we know has come to be what it is for us. All three agree in asserting that there is no Spirit in man apart from the Given, ruled by its own Ideals, and shaping the Given for its own ends. The first two may be called the ontological forms, the last the epistemological form, of Naturalism. But the ontological and epistemological forms cannot be consistently held by the same person. The man who holds that everything is but a form of Matter or of Energy, cannot, with any right, hold that he knows this through his sense-impressions. For if he uses these to mean the simplest psychical states, his right to pass beyond them can be at once questioned, as the theory of Psychologism has indeed candidly recognised. But if he cannot pass beyond sense-impressions, how can he know that the All has come from Matter or from Energy? The pressure of this question has proved too much for the ontological schools of Naturalism. If they say, "We know," there is at once implied a world of knowledge as distinct from that of being; there is implied also a knower; and these implications are found to contain problems which these schools cannot answer. The Idealistic schools of Spiritualism have lost no opportunity of making prominent these problems, and as a last resort Naturalism has fallen back upon the theory of Psychologism. Sensations and their

mechanical combinations can account for the All as I know it. Very good, but the statement implies that a statement is made for others to agree or disagree with. Whence comes the knowledge of others? Whence comes the knowledge that they can agree or disagree with any statement? Can anyone pass from mere sensations to a knowledge of others? Is there not implied in the idea of agreement in knowledge something which this theory does not account for? Münsterberg has admirably summed up the dilemmas in which Psychologism here finds itself:—"Only our mind-stuff is real. Yet I have no right to call it 'ours,' as those other personalities whom I perceive exist also only as my perceptions; they are philosophically all in my own consciousness, which I never can transcend. But have I still the right to call that MY consciousness? An I has a meaning only where a Thou is granted; where no Alter is, there cannot be an Ego. The real world is, therefore, not my consciousness, but an absolutely impersonal consciousness, in which a series of psychical states goes on in succession." He goes on to show that we cannot know succession nor time (on the basis of this theory), and then sums up as follows:—"The real psychical fact is without time as without personality; it is for nobody, for no end, and with no value. That is the last word of a psychology which pretends to be philosophy."[1] This is the *reductio ad absurdum* of the latest theory of Naturalism; and I hold that every theory of

[1] *Psychology and Life*, p. 14.

Naturalism, logically worked out, lands itself in the same position. Let me establish this.

Naturalism and the Unity of Self-consciousness. The deepest and most fundamental fact in Life is the unity of self-consciousness. Without it there could be no intelligence, no memory, no reasoning, and no speech. Psychologism has in vain endeavoured to account for it by the combination or accumulation of sensations; but no mechanical combination, no mechanical production, can account for or describe it. Every such attempt but begs the question by employing and implying, all the time, that which is to be accounted for. It is not a mechanical combination, but a spiritual fact; and as such must be spiritually known, to be understood. Here we have evidence that in man there is that which is not material, nor a mere aggregate of sense-impressions. What is it? It can reason and work for ends. It ever thinks and works according to reason. Yet Naturalism would have us believe that this Spirit with its reason has been evolved from Non-Reason or Un-Reason. This is the point which Mr. Balfour presses home with such force. Or if it strive to get rid of the difficulty by attributing to the evolving Matter a spirit or reason, it involves itself in difficulties greater than that it thinks to escape. It must in the first place give a new definition to Matter, and it must in the second give proofs that Matter as known possesses a spirit or reason. Allowing that original Matter possessed a spirit, the further

question arises: What final explanation will account for Spirit and Matter? Thus must Naturalism either seek to evolve Spirit, which stress of facts compels it to admit is something other than Matter as known, from Matter, and so contradict its own principle of Causality; or it is forced to abandon its claims to be a final account of the All.

The Given can never yield the Ought. There can be no distinction between Truth and Error if the Given is the All in All of all things; for Truth is possible only if there be an Ought as distinguished from the Is; The True is always in accordance with what Ought to Be. If the Given be the final criterion of Truth, what can distinguish between so-called true and false sensations, so-called true and false declarations? All are alike given. The sensations of colour I receive may be blue to me, to another man, green; but what is to decide that I am right and he wrong, or *vice versâ?* If Naturalism give the true account of things, then there can be no such distinctions as true and false, good and bad, beautiful and ugly; there can be no ranking men and things in the scale of better and worse. Not only Religion, Morality, and Art, but Natural Science, too, is rendered impossible; for all these speak of a spiritual realm above the Given, all aim at necessary and universal Truth, and therefore at an Ought not-yet-realised, not-yet-given. But if there be no Truth, how is speech possible; for it, too, is based on the supposition

of an Ought-to-Be? What becomes of the system of Naturalism itself? Does it not profess to give the Truth of things? As long ago as Plato, men saw that a consistent Naturalism should be dumb. That Naturalism professes to give Absolute Truth, to distinguish between a true and a false theory of the Universe, is not only a refutation of its own position, a confession that men, in order to believe aright, *ought* to think in one particular way, but it is also a revelation of that Spirit which frames Naturalism and every other theory, and which, in spite of all attempts to stifle it, will make its voice heard, and its presence felt. If man still continue to make the old distinctions between true and false, if Naturalism itself must admit there is a true and a false, it is because there is a something at the heart of Life, which Naturalism makes no attempt to know.

Some of the Petitiones Principii *of Naturalism—It never proves its fundamental positions.* There is nothing but the Given; it is Matter and mechanical laws, says one theory; Energy and its forms, says another; Sensations and mechanical combinations, says the third. These are the assertions laid down as fundamental positions, and they remain unproved assumptions to the end. Even if they be granted, Naturalism cannot account for Life as it is; as we have noticed, its vaunted explanation but results in a *reductio ad absurdum.*

Every form of Naturalism in spite of itself implies a Spirit in man other and higher than the

Given or Non-Spiritual, which it asserts is the All. We can see this from—

(*a*) The profession which every form makes of giving Absolute Truth. It offers necessary and universal truth. In this implication of a truth which all men ought to accept there is a spiritual realm presented which makes baseless the foundations of Naturalism.

(*b*) The profession made that it, and it alone, satisfies certain demands. Among these may be named—

That for Unity.
" " Simplicity.
" " Consistency.
" " Intelligibility.
" " an Adequate Explanation of all the facts.

It is not my present purpose to examine how far the forms satisfy these tests. I believe that a detailed examination would prove the hollowness of the claim respecting each and all. What I wish here to point out is, that Naturalism constructs its theories according to these demands, cannot help doing so, indeed, if it is to get any hearing from the minds of men; and yet it is utterly unable to account for them. Not only so, it always asserts that the Given is first, and from it (be it Matter or Sensation) all comes—Life, Spirit, Necessary Truth, All; but these demands will be found to be first, will be found to be authoritative from the beginning,—they rule the Given, not the Given,

them. If we ask Naturalism to account for this, it is dumb.

(*c*) Every theory of Naturalism will be found on examination to be an answer to a problem, which the Spirit of man sets itself to solve. The problem in general terms is this: Under certain limitations and conditions, how can the All be accounted for?—for example, given matter and its known laws, how can the Universe be built? That the Spirit does not come into the explanation in its true guise, or Life assume its true colours, is due to the limitations laid down; but that the Spirit is present, shaping the solution into some satisfaction of its demands, that is, of Truth, is evident from all which has been already said. Let me support this position by a quotation from Professor Münsterberg's *Psychology and Life*:—"The real will is free, and it is the work of such free will to picture, for its own purposes, the world as an unfree, a causally connected, an existing system; and if it is the triumph of modern psychology to master even the best in man, the will, and to dissolve the will into its atomistic sensations and their causal unfree play, we are blind if we forget that this transformation and construction is itself the work of will which dictates ends, and [is] the finest herald of its freedom" (p. 31). The Will or Spirit of man is thus outside the system it itself creates. In more than one significant passage in his epoch-making *Logic* does Professor Sigwart emphasise the same truth.[1]

[1] See quotation, chap. ii. sec. iii. sub-sec. 2.

(*d*) Every Naturalistic Theory puts an Abstraction for the whole Reality of Life, one spiritual manifestation for the whole spirit; Materialism builds on the Natural Sciences, Psychologism on Psychology. Here we have evidence of a tendency to error to which the Spirit of man is prone—the tendency to get drunk with its own successes, and to substitute the outward success for the true conqueror. Man, as we shall learn later, is ever called on to subdue the Given to the demands of his Spirit; can in fact grow only when his Spirit through one or more of its activities is thus manifesting its power. There is no growth for man which is not a growth of his Spirit, and there is no spiritual growth other than through a transformation of the Given by means of spiritual energy and spiritual activity. Every new concept gained, every new judgment arrived at, every new theory established, is the evidence of such a transformation and such a growth. But man is tempted to take the Form of the transformation for the transforming Spirit, the weapon for the champion, the one spiritual activity through which the Spirit has rushed to victory for the living and acting Spirit. This temptation attends all the efforts as all the successes of man. It can be seen in the history of his Religions, of his Moral Codes, and his Art Canons, as in his attitude towards the brilliant victories which have attended his labours in Natural Science during this century. The temptation is, indeed, a mark of his freedom, but none the less a frequent

occasion of his fall. When one opens his eyes to see that Natural Science, like Art or Government, is but a manifestation or activity of the Spirit of man; is that manifestation in which the Spirit goes forth in the conquest of the Given of Nature, and proceeds to subdue it to its own Absolute demands; he wonders how man can be so blind as to mistake the manifestation for the Spirit manifested, and so stupid as to make an idol of his own creation. Yet so it is, and so it is in every form of Naturalism.

In every term, moreover, which Naturalism uses, the question is begged. In ordinary speech we say that the terms of the mental sciences were first used of physical facts. This is only half a truth. There is no such thing as a purely material term; with more truth could we say, all terms are spiritual. When Natural Science employs the terms, it necessarily must do so abstractly; from the very nature of its view-point it uses them with reference to the material implication only; when, however, they are used with reference to spiritual realities, their import is entirely changed. *Spiritus* no longer means the breath of our nostrils, *Reason* does not mean a mere process of calculating, *Apprehension* has no reference to a manual grasp, *Heart* does not indicate the blood-pump of the body, *Life* does not only mean our physical existence, and *Evolution* or *Development* imports no mere combination of atoms or the regular, progressive, and determined unfolding of a germ. Only through a spiritual experience can the new signification be understood.

He that is deaf cannot understand sound; it is vain to tell a blind man of colour; so the poet's portraiture of the glories of the setting sun will be the incoherent ravings of the maniac to him who has not opened his eyes to the beauties of nature, and all talk of Love, Unselfishness, Virtue, Holiness, and Spiritual Growth will be the very chattering of fools to them who have not entered into the experience which makes all these possible. A true philosophy in every age has to defend the spiritual heritage which such terms transmit, and every spiritual sphere, more particularly Religion and Morality, is kept awake and vigilant in arms, through the frequent and unceasing inroads of Formalism and Materialism on every one of its terms. In the present day we can see the combat waging round such terms as: Power, Development, Progress, Fact, Experience, Life, Reality, Truth. When all such terms are used of Reality and in Truth, they should be defined through what they represent, not through their denotation in some particular domain of Knowledge or Life; any other procedure is neither scientific nor right.

Thus Naturalism begs the question from the beginning. If it say at the outset: There is nothing but matter; how can it afterwards allow Spirit to be? If it lay down: All is from Sensation; how can it afterwards get in Free Will? If it proceed on the assumptions that the only manifestation of the Spirit is Natural Science, its methods of inquiry the only methods, its tests of Truth the only tests;

if, moreover, it leaves out of sight the Spirit altogether, and substitutes the dead form of its manifestation,—how can it afterwards allow their rightful places to Art, Social Progress, Morality, and Religion? To be consistent with its premises, it cannot be just to Life and Reality. But it has yet to establish its fundamental assumptions, it has to justify its procedure, and it has to substantiate the claim that Natural Science, a spiritual manifestation itself, is the sole judge of Truth and Reality. Till these are done, we are left to wonder how defenders of Naturalism can assert that that system is Absolute Truth, or absolute at least for man, and reflects the whole of Reality, which, in its every postulate and throughout its procedure, ignores the Spirit which has called both them and it into being.

Naturalism and Progress. The attainment of Truth anywhere is the realisation of an Ideal. Thus is it that not only Morality, Art, and Religion, but Natural Science also, declares Naturalism false. And this declaration is known to be the voice of Eternal Truth when it is seen that Morality and Truth are inseparable. Thus the assumption of the truth of Naturalism results in a conclusion so contradictory to the facts of Life, that it cannot be termed even a caricature of them. So if we ask it to explain or describe the great fact of Human Progress, it lands itself in contradictions and *reductiones ad absurdum.* We can establish this in two ways: either by taking Progress in its historical

development, or by taking all that the conception of Progress includes and implies. Naturalism builds on What Is, The Accomplished Fact, The Given; logically with it, the Is to Be, The Not-yet-realised, The Ideal, are dreams which must not be reckoned with in the search for Truth. Now if we examine any step in Progress, more particularly in Social Progress, we shall see that the first reformer who took that step, and through whose influence others took it, declared the What Is, The Accomplished Fact, to be false, and the Not-yet-realised, the Ideal, to be true. In all reforms, wherever accomplished, it is the same story. He who begins it, condemns the actual state of things, and declares that Truth will be found in a state not yet ushered in. He wins others to his belief; persecution, martyrdom even, may be their reward at the hands of their fellows, but they heed not; and when the reform is won, all see they spoke the truth. No reform, individual or social, would ever have been undertaken, were Truth founded on What Is, The Given. When we turn to examine the conception of Progress, we find that much of the plausibility of the naturalistic account of Human Progress arises from a false use of the term. Naturalism can use it only to mean a mechanical evolution: matter works itself up into new forms, or new sense-impressions unite with the old to form new concepts in the mind. Logically this is all the content it can give it; and were it always thus baldly stated, people would sooner open their

eyes to the inability of Naturalism to treat Life seriously. But there is usually added to this content; the working for a purpose and the conception of an end to which the evolution is tending:—This may be done unconsciously, but if done at all, the position of Naturalism is abandoned. It is so impossible for man to use the term Evolution or any term involving the idea of Progress, even in speaking of dead matter, without implying in it the conception of an end, that Naturalists and their readers are often unaware of the logic of their position. But Naturalism cannot imply in its conception of Human Progress any End; the Not-yet-realised is not within its thought; there is no Absolute End which governs and judges Human Progress; the What Is is all we know at present; when it has become something else we shall then know the Is-to-Be, but not till then. But take from Progress the idea of an end to be attained, and what is there left? Nothing that has any resemblance to what man judges Progress to be. If human work and human thought are to remain as we know them, Human Progress must imply an End, and an Absolute End, according to which the whole is judged. If this be so, Naturalism stands condemned.

The Final Word. Thus is Naturalism condemned. It has taken an abstraction for Reality, a part of Life for its whole, the form for the Spirit. It has not, entering into Life as it is, endeavoured to understand it, and then explain it; but unwarrantably and

illegitimately it has interpreted Life from one point of view. Because it cannot account for spiritual manifestations which are the very basis of Life, it declares them to be illusions or delusions, heedless that if they be so, Life itself falls into chaos, and Naturalism itself must be swallowed up in the darkness of primeval Night. The best condemnation of Naturalism is not only its resolution of Life into that which is without form and void, but also its resolution of itself into nothingness and eternal silence.

SEC. IV. IDEALISTIC THEORIES WHICH ARE ERRONEOUS OR DEFECTIVE.

By Idealistic Theories I understand all those systems of thought which assert the reality of the Spirit of man and base Truth on laws or Ideals over man. The truth of things for them is not on the surface, in the realised, in the sensuous; but in the rational and the spiritual. The theories, which I here group together as erroneous, include all those forms of Rationalism and Idealism, which, while granting all this, so elevate the Reason as to give a false view of the Spirit, and so a false view of Life and Work. Truth is to be gained only through the speculative Reason, they declare. Reason thus becomes something apart from the Work of Life, and by some is spoken of as if it sat on the throne of the Spirit apart from all other activities, and judged of the truth of each and all. In extreme schools of Idealism thought comes to be regarded

not "as an account of the world, but as the world itself; Life becomes a binomial theorem; and the universe is only an 'unearthly ballet of bloodless categories.'" In all, the true nature of the Spirit is lost sight of, the unity of the Spirit is ignored, and so we find ourselves landed in contradictions and untenable positions from which none of these theories can extricate us. Of every ultimate theory we have to ask: Does it give us back Life or merely its dead image? Do the great facts of Life remain, or are they spirited away? Do Truth, Goodness, Beauty, and Love still rule as dominant and indispensable conceptions, or are they denied their place? Are Temptation and Sin accounted for, or are they explained away? Do Difficulty, Doubt, Work, and Progress have their full significance granted them? In short, is the theory rooted in the roots of Life itself and as wide and comprehensive as Life is? These are vital questions. The Idealistic Theories under consideration cannot stand the test when called on to answer them, as we shall now see.

These Theories cannot give the right view of Progress, nor the right view of the pursuit and attainment of Truth. Human Progress, as we have seen, implies Absolute Ideals, through which guidance and standards of criticism are given to human endeavours. But it also implies growth, acquired strength, and vision through exercise, in the Spirit of man. Were that Spirit to remain stationary at any stage of its growth,

no incitement from within would enable it to grasp the new or reach out to fresh discoveries. Content with its experience it would remain; and neither doubt nor difficulty would disturb its calm. The Spirit of man under the government of Absolute Ideals is ever incited to reach out beyond the acquired and the ascertained; but ere the new can be grasped or the discovery made there must come fresh strength and enlarged and keener vision. For Progress implies the grappling with difficulties greater than any yet overcome; and the attainment of higher views of Truth than any yet attained; and these are possible only through growth of the Spirit. Now the question to answer is: What is it that grows? Is it the Spirit as a whole, as a unity, or is it Reason only? The former alternative is the only credible one. But if the Spirit grows as a whole, and if this growth is ever expressed by an increased mastery over the Given, Progress for man cannot mean only an enlarged stock of ideas or clearer views on the relation of things; and Truth for man is no mere product of abstract reasoning, but it is an attainment of the Spirit achieved through living experience, expressed in deed, and reflected in word. Nor is Truth so easily gained as, or gained in the way in which, these theories would have us believe. The Real for man is ever changing, or rather its content grows with his growth; the problems of Life are ever changing: the same situation never returns again. The general in the battlefield must make the best application of past experience he

can, but he himself is called on to make plans for a situation which no general has ever yet been confronted with, and, if he is the man for the hour, he will devise something altogether original, and lay down lessons in war for all future military cadets to study. The physician in his practice, the teacher in his school, the mother in her home, the pastor in his visitations, the social reformer in our slums,—all are daily confronted with new and perplexing experiences, with fresh and unsolved problems, which they on the spur of the moment must meet and solve as best they can. Where lies the Truth in these cases, and how has it to be gained? It is not the reading off of something already learned, it is no conclusion to be gained by abstract reasoning; it is rather an invention to be discovered, a work to be done. We have seen that the theories of Naturalism fail lamentably to account for Human Progress; the theories before us are in no better plight when asked to explain the unity in the Progress of the race, associated, as it is, with a ceaseless unfolding in the contents of those Ends which man in all his activities is ever striving to attain.

These Theories either narrow the Spirit of man to abstract reason, or they so belittle its other sides or aspects that they fill subordinate places. Reason, they declare, is paramount; Feeling and Will are apprehended and known only through Reason; all the manifestations of the Spirit[1] receive their ends through Reason.

[1] By manifestations of the Spirit I shall henceforth mean,

Reason thus threatens to swallow the whole mind, and indeed sets itself up as the arbiter of the destinies of every manifestation and activity of the Spirit. This severance of Reason from the Life as a whole, is aided by a false view of Psychology. It is another instance of that fallacy, already noticed, of taking an abstraction for the concrete whole. As we shall hereafter see, Reason is in every manifestation and activity of the Spirit of man, in every so-called Feeling, Desire, Resolution, and Aspiration. Were it apart from the activities, as this theory leads one to believe, it could not know them nor their ends; it would be impossible for it to judge them; they and it would be absolutely foreign to each other. Reason, we may say, is, in every activity, not giving its ends to the activity, but bringing the activity's own end into consciousness, not judging the activity

Morality, Art, Natural Science, Government, etc., or those knowledges and institutions of man in which his Spirit is revealed as a whole, in which the activity or activities of his whole Spirit (of Cognition, Feeling, and Will in indissoluble union) are at work, and in which Thought and Work go hand in hand towards the same goal. These are manifestations of man's life, modes of expressing his whole Spirit. Single activities, such as Reasoning, Loving, Resolving, are also true manifestations, inasmuch as the Spirit as a whole is present in them; but we can easily distinguish between these and the larger manifestations, in which the single activities are all engaged and are constantly repeating themselves. The end of the larger manifestation unifies the ends of all the activities working within it, just as the final end of life unifies the ends of all manifestations whatsoever. The full characteristic of a manifestation will be given when I discuss whether Religion is such a manifestation (Chap. IV.). Henceforth manifestation and activity will be distinguished as above.

by standards it has brought, but by the end of the activity itself. This mode of speech is allowable, but we have always to remember that by Reason here is meant the whole Spirit viewed in a particular way. In Fact and in Reality there is no such entity as Cognition or Abstract Reasoning. Either this view of Reason is correct, or we must surrender the Unity of Consciousness. All these positions will be fully supported later; but, in the meantime, we must clear our minds of false abstractions, and view facts as they are. Split up the Spirit of man into three separate compartments at the beginning, make Reason the autocrat and Sultan over the destinies of man, and one can never restore the Unity of Spirit thus surrendered, or give its rightful place to any activity or manifestation of the Spirit. All kinds of contradictions at once arise in the Life. If the rational alone, *i.e.*, that which is in accordance with the Speculative Reason, be real, what are we to say of the Moral Sphere and its Ideals? If mere thinking, logical syllogising, alone attains the Real, Conduct and all practical activities are rendered irrational and inexplicable: the serious work of Life is devoid of Reason. The Natural Scientist, when framing hypotheses and drawing conclusions from them, is reaching the Real; but when he is experimenting and observing, when he is patiently gathering facts, Reason is wanting to him, and Reality is brought no nearer to him. The thinking out of a plan gives one the Rational, but the carrying of it out into execution leads one into Unreality.

Truth is separated from Goodness; a theory can be declared True which poisons the Life embracing it; and it can be doubted if the good man possesses Truth at all. Character, Work, and Final End can have only a fictitious value assigned to them; Morality may be tolerated, but it has no justification in itself. Only Intellect gives the Real—only Intellect, then, should Mind or Spirit be; Feelings, Desires, and Aspirations may be suppressed as useless; but since all these belong to the Spirit equally with Reason itself, it is not easy to see how Reason can justify its own existence if they be suppressed. If one side of the Life is declared unreal, what is to declare the other side real; if one side is useless, what can determine the other side essential; how are we to be sure that the Spirit can be preserved if any of its activities are suppressed? All these contradictions and dilemmas spring from a false view of Reason, a denial of the Unity of Consciousness, and the substitution of an abstraction for Reality.

Contradictory views of Truth. In these schools the Speculative Reason arrogates to itself the sole decision on Truth and Reality; yet the Speculative Reason cannot deny that it itself is only an activity or manifestation of that Spirit of which Art and Morality are manifestations. It, however, appropriates all Reason to itself, and declares Truth to be what is in accordance with its own constitutive principles. Now these have to be taken on trust, and this we must do if we will have reasoning at

all; but Art and Morality, too, have their fundamental postulates; and the question at once arises: Why should these not be placed on the same basis with those of the Speculative Reason, and why should Truth in Art and in Morality not be: Consonance with the fundamental postulates of each? To say there is no reason for doing otherwise, would be to grant a Reason immanent to Art and Morality, and to introduce a view of Truth contradictory to that which this theory lays down. When we turn, too, to see how the Truth of Art and Morality, as acknowledged by this theory, accords with facts, we are not met with puzzling contradictions and unsatisfactory answers. If Reason be not immanent to Art, Morality, and other manifestations of the Spirit, but to the Speculative Reason alone, and if Truth be agreement with the constitutive principles of Reason, it is clear that Morality and Art are to Reason but as objects of nature—they are given—and no longer can we speak of normative sciences of either. But this is to surrender both as they are known to be; for if we are deprived of the right of judging each immanently through their own Absolute Ideals, to speak of their Truth is the same as to speak of the life of the bodies in the dissecting-rooms. So in Social Reform, in Law, in Invention, in the Practical Activities of Life, this view of Truth fails to disclose to us what the Truth is or where it lies. When a musician arises from his instrument in triumphant joy and exclaims: "That's IT, I can play IT now"; when an

audience, thrilled with delight, shout of a singer: "She has IT, she has expressed the very soul of the song"; when a painter stands back from his canvas, and with the hopes and fears, thoughts and emotions of his lifelong years of unflagging effort living in his utterance, critically affirms: "I have IT, I must have been inspired when I did IT"; when a reader of Carlyle, Emerson, Ruskin, or Browning, says of some beautifully expressed thought never uttered in his hearing before: "He has given IT utterance; that is Truth; I have long desired so to express IT,"—these theories are unable to give the full meaning to their judgments. Were it not for an Absolute Ideal ruling the minds of men, such judgments would be impossible; and were it not for a growth of the Spirit, giving a new and enlarged mastery over the Given, the expression of the Ideal could not come into being; the truth of the judgment includes the fact of this growth of the Spirit. A theory is therefore wanted which can explain these judgments, and can unify the view of Truth contained in them with all other views of Truth. The Unity of Consciousness, the Unity of the Spirit in all and through all its activities and manifestations being the primal fact in man, he cannot entertain different, not to say contradictory, views of Truth. Neither can he accept contradictions in his thought, in his theories, nor in his Life. As he himself is one, so must his views of Truth be one, and so must his theory of Life be self-consistent, and inclusive of all the facts. This, the final test of every theory,

is the ever-abiding, ever-active evidence of the presence of a Spirit in man, even though the theory itself may in words assert the opposite.

The contradictions presented by Error and Sin. If only the Rational as defined by these theories is the Real, what are we to say of Error and Sin—that they are Real or Unreal? If Real, then are they Rational. But Rational they cannot be, since they are opposed to Truth, and therefore to the constitutive principles of Reason. Can we say of them, then, that they are Unreal? But what of the watchfulness man must exercise, lest he fall into their snares? What views of the Unreal must we have, to give an explanation of the misery wrought by falsehood and vice, and of the opposition to Progress which is always being made by erroneous views, by selfishness, and by wickedness? The man in Error or Sin will give his reasons for his conduct, and is surely as real an agent as is the seeker for Intellectual Truth, or the Moral Reformer himself. Is it not the very Reality of the former which calls for such strenuous efforts and such ceaseless warfare on the part of the latter? Error and Sin cannot be declared Real by these theories; yet the facts of Life will not allow them to be called Unreal. What, then, are they?

SEC. V. THE FINAL VERDICT.

The Criticism, to which the foregoing theories have been subjected, is ample to prove their insufficiency as an adequate explanation of Life.

All philosophical theories have for their aims: the unification of the manifestations of Life, the revelation of the Real, and the discovery and proclamation of Truth. The theories examined have failed because they attempt the impossible: they take the form of a particular manifestation of Life, and from that, try to get the living Spirit. It reminds one of the old attempt to account for living protoplasm by an exhibition of its chemical elements: oxygen, hydrogen, nitrogen, and carbon. "Here are some water, ammonia, and carbonic acid"— And whilst you gaze with hushed breath, expecting the revelation of the mighty secret, looking curiously for the electric spark which is to turn these into living organism, you merely are informed that, by feeding Protoplasm, which is already alive, with these, it will by and by *turn out a fresh supply of life.*[1] Here the Life, which makes Protoplasm what it is, is ignored, and, in the theories we are dealing with, the Spirit of man is likewise either ignored or badly mutilated. Each of them is based on a particular manifestation or aspect of Life: Materialism on Natural Science, Psychologism on Psychology, Rationalism and Abstract or Logical Idealism on the philosophising instinct or manifestation itself. Since these all give some aspect of Reality, the true theory must embrace the Truth found in each. But the true theory will start with no one-sided view of Life. Like Descartes, it will

[1] Adapted from *Studies in Philosophy*, by Rev. J. Lightfoot (pp. 139–140).

find its starting-point in Life, or the Human Spirit; but its *Cogito* will include not only "I think," but also "I feel and will, I live and do—I am conscious in the fullest sense of that term." Starting thus, it will avoid the cleft between Subject and Object which yawned impassable before Descartes' narrow definition of *Cogito*, and that wider chasm between Thought and Action which Kant's treatment of Reason could not bridge. Only a theory starting thus can avoid the contradictions which, we have seen, beset all one-sided explanations, and can give the full view of Life as it is, without calling any of its manifestations illusions or delusions. It will make Truth, as necessary and universal, and Progress both possible, by giving the spiritual links between the individual and his fellows not only of his own generation, but of all generations past and future. It will base itself on the Unity of Consciousness, and so on the Unity of the Spirit throughout all its manifestations, as the impregnable and everlasting foundation not only of Philosophy, but of Life, without which no Science, no Thought, and no Consciousness is possible; and it will seek therefrom to give such an account of Reason, the Given, and Work, as will unify and harmonise all the various activities and manifestations of the Spirit, and, consequently, to rear thereon an edifice of Life harmonious in all its parts, inclusive of every known fact, and fashioned under the demands of Absolute Truth, towards whose fuller realisation the building is ever progressing and aspiring.

CHAPTER II.

THE TRUE VIEW OF THE SPIRIT OF MAN AND OF REALITY.

Introduction. That there is Reality in Life; that man in all the manifestations of his Spirit which reveal his true character, and make good his Progress, is aiming at Absolute Truth; that to violate the Unity of Consciousness and the consequent Unity of Life in all its manifestations, is to land Thought in hopeless contradictions and to ignore the most fundamental fact of human existence; and that only a teleological interpretation of Life can give their rightful place to the spiritual manifestations, can show how necessary and universal Truth is possible, and can account for human Progress,—these are propositions which we may now regard as established, or soon to be established. They may all be regarded as fundamental postulates or intuitive truths, since without them Life as we know it, Truth for all men in any department, and Progress, are inexplicable and impossible. The man who denies them, contradicts himself. The task which now awaits us is that immanent criticism

of Life we have asserted to be the true vocation of Philosophy. We must get that view of the Human Spirit which will sustain the foregoing propositions, and which will give an adequate explanation of Reason and Work, Progress and Retrogression, Truth and Error, Goodness and Wickedness. We shall then more clearly see that human Progress cannot be accounted for by any theory of mere Intellectualism. Man does not sit down in his study-chair and, apart from actual work, spin out the plan by which advance in any department of Life is made. Nor can the so-called Evolution of man be accounted for if Free Will be denied to him. It is as a moral agent that man thinks, and works, and strives for Truth. He is called on to realise himself, but this he can do only through the mastery of the Given—be it Nature or Self—and every step is the result of a moral choice. Hence the mission of man is Work, and Thought is subsidiary to this; or if the Thought be a real conquest of the Given, a fresh interpretation of the Is, exalting and strengthening the Spirit, it must be regarded as a Work itself. But man is not called on to struggle aimlessly; his conquests are ever directed by Absolute Ends, and in accordance with these his true Work is done and his Progress is effected. So comes it that Reality for man lies in the Spiritual, that Truth means correspondence with an Absolute End, and that mastery over a Given is a supreme test of Truth; so comes it, too, that Error is possible to man, that Sin is possible, and that Rectification and

Repentance are possible. We have now to take the great facts of Life, and rightly determine what view of the Spirit of man will account for them all.

SEC. I. THE PLACE OF THE IDEALS IN THE LIFE.

There can be no Natural Science apart from an Absolute Ideal. It is usually believed that Natural Science has nothing of the spiritual in its presuppositions, methods, or aims, and that it has no connection or concern with Art, Morality, Religion, or any spiritual manifestation whatsoever. Let me quote from Professor Flint's *Anti-Theistic Theories* (1st edit., p. 106): "The mere study of physical nature does not carry us beyond matter and its processes. Its most elaborate methods can give us no apprehension of God, or soul, or moral sense. So far as mere physical science can discern, 'if God had slept a million years all things would be the same.' No telescope or microscope can enable us to discern free will or any other attribute of mind. Physical science can only tell us of physical objects, physical properties, and physical laws. If no other voice is to be heard, no other witness to be called, the verdict of reason must necessarily be that materialism is true." Now I do not wish to wrest this paragraph from its connections, nor to put into the Professor's mouth an opinion he would not accept as his own. The use of the word *mere* in the opening sentence shows that he is thinking of Natural Science by itself,

abstractly, or apart from the Life; but I shall take this quotation as the opinion of many who believe that it is true of Natural Science, no matter how viewed. Natural Science, they hold, can give us no apprehension of God, or soul, or moral sense. Now in the *first place*, if the Unity of Consciousness is a fact, how can such a contention be upheld? Does Natural Science not spring from a particular movement of the Spirit; and if so, can it stand out of relation to any other movement or manifestation of the Spirit? Is the Natural Scientist when at his own special work, the same man who, at other times and in other relations, plays different parts? Who can maintain otherwise? But surely this is to acknowledge that Natural Science cannot be divorced from the other manifestations of the Spirit, and implies a Spirit working, and all else implied in this! In the *second place*, if Truth is to have one meaning throughout all the manifestations of Life, how can Natural Science be viewed as cut off from its spiritual source; nay, how is Truth at all possible for it, if there be not in its work and development the government of an Absolute Ideal, the creation of no man, yet authoritative over all? Natural Science, like all other manifestations, aims at necessary and universal Truth, and this implies an *Ought* distinct from, and authoritative over, the *Is*. The recognition of this carries us beyond the domain of the Given into that of the Spiritual; for it is only to a Spirit having its true home in the Absolute, that such a distinction as that between

Ought and *Is* is possible. In the *third place,* Natural Science not only proclaims the reality of the Spirit and of a Spiritual realm, but it also, in all its procedure and development, acknowledges that obedience to a spiritual authority which constitutes Morality. This will be more evident when we treat of the vital connection between Truth and Morality, but it can be seen from the compliance with the demands of its Ideal which Natural Science so absolutely yields, from the statements by leading scientists on the virtues engendered by the discipline of scientific research, and from the lives of these very scientists themselves. In the *fourth place,* the presuppositions, aims, and criteria of the Natural Scientist shatter to fragments the contention we are now opposing. Let us look at any part of his procedure and we shall see him endeavouring to pierce to the unity which, he *must believe,* subtly links them, and which, gained, gives him spiritual authority over them. If we watch him framing and testing his hypotheses, we can see the same Ideal of Unity dominating all he does. No theory can be accepted which does not bring all the facts into unity, or which does not allow every relevant fact to be deduced from a common principle. Such a grasp of the Given is possible only to a spiritual insight, and would be neither attempted nor accepted were Truth for the Spirit of man anything else than the fulfilment of the demands of an Absolute Ideal. The Natural Scientist, like all other workers who develop the Spirit of man by the conquest of a

Given, works with spiritual presuppositions, aims at spiritual ideals, and is ever postulating that his Spirit can interpret Nature, and is thus implying an Absolute, governing all true interpretations. This is what Religion, in its interpretation of the results of Natural Science, has ever affirmed, and it is one of the functions of Religion to show what is the final presupposition which all this rests on.

There is no Morality possible if Absolute Ideals be denied to the Spirit. Whatever the divisions between the different schools of Ethics may be, their discussions and contentions have made it plain that there can be no Moral Conduct and no Moral Judgment if there be no distinction between the *Ought* and the *Is*. No theory of Ethics worthy of the name can be wrung from ever so careful an investigation of the facts of the Moral Life, regarded merely as facts to be classified. Man is man only in so far as he can consciously place ends consonant with his nature and activities before his action, and strive for their realisation. To say that these ends are given by Sense-Experience, is to leave out of account two things: (1) The primitive activities which alone make any experience possible; (2) the selection of certain objects as ends, or means of realising ends, and the rejection of others. Even the extreme Hedonistic school must declare that nothing is good in itself, but only in so far as it satisfies a capacity for pleasure in conscious man; in other words, that the end of man's conduct lies in himself. If the Hedonist will describe this

capacity so that all the facts will be accounted for, he must, in the *first place*, affirm it to be spiritual. It belongs to man's consciousness, is other than and above the objects of Sense-Experience, and distinguishes between these by an end immanent in itself. In the *second place*, the history of the Moral Consciousness, and of the codes of Morality show this capacity to be capable of an indefinite, perhaps infinite, development. And ever its judgment rings out clear: My end is not yet realised. This fact, alone, is enough to overturn any and every Naturalistic theory of Ethics. No transmutation of sensuous elements can result in that which is above them, which refuses to ascribe its origin to them, which is continually approving of them or condemning them, and which is ever rising above every attempt at its satisfaction to a purer and fuller realisation of its end. As in the intellectual, so in the moral judgment there is a reference to an Absolute Ideal; and the history of Moral Progress is inexplicable, if it be not the continued attempt to give an ever fuller content to this Ideal.

History is inexplicable apart from the presence in man of Absolute Ideals. If we are to understand History aright, we must recognise in the Life of man, besides the so-called selfish ends, the presence of others, having the power to win men to their service, even at the surrender of self, and to control and direct their whole lives. Only through these are social reform and moral advance explicable, and the life of the reformer, the philanthropist,

and the martyr, intelligible. To say these were mere dreamers is to misinterpret facts. They were the makers of History; hence if History is to have a basis in Reality, their lives and aims must be based on the Real, or be of the Real. But these pioneers of Freedom and Toleration, these heralds of Enlightenment and Progress, these Prophets, Poets, Sages, Martyrs, Discoverers, Inventors, Soldiers, Statesmen, and Philanthropists, by whom the advance of man was first foreseen, and who laboured so unwearyingly to secure it, were all, according to their own lifelong declarations, slaves of Ideals. To win others to the service of these, to lead them to the source from which their Spirits drew sustenance and inspiration, was one great aim of their life-work; to strive to bring these Ideals into the realm of the concrete, to make their daily life the gospel of them and their own characters a revelation of them, and to embody them in social institutions and new modes of national life, was the other. To secure both or either they would gladly die, conscious that their Death would but serve the ends they strove for, and would convince men that their Ideals led to the true Real.

Only through Absolute Ideals is it possible to explain man's relations to his fellows. Since the Truth of Natural Science, the Goodness of Morality, and the Progress of man, are all under the control and direction of Absolute Ideals, it is easy to show that no part or domain of Life is excluded from their authority. Society itself is possible only

through their acknowledgment. Men in sympathy with each other, in mutual help and co-operation, bowing to the same standards of Truth and obeying the same codes of Morality, are confessing that their lives are under the authority of the Spiritual and (viewed in its final implications) of One Supreme Spirit. It is thus man releases himself at once from Selfishness and Subjectivism, and enters a spiritual brotherhood where all alike are members one of the other, and servants of the one master. The Absolute Ends of the Spirit are not over one man, but over all. This is not to say that man is compelled to accept these ends, or that he is an automaton in their hands, determined as to all he does. He must accept them if he will realise himself, but he can do otherwise. No aggregation of individuals, each viewed as a mere selfish unit, can produce a Society. The link which binds the members of the same community together is spiritual, not mechanical; it is the love and service of a supreme end which unite in closest bonds. No Society has ever yet been established on mechanical lines and on a selfish foundation; none has ever survived the denial of an Absolute in its Religion, Morality, or Laws; and every nation has thriven best, when its citizens were inspired to realise great, unselfish ends, and have believed with all their heart that there were duties they ought to perform, whatever might be the cost.

SEC. II. ON THE ABSOLUTE IDEALS.

1. *The Ideals and the Work of the Spirit in its Manifestations.* If what I have already affirmed be based on the facts of Life, if I have faithfully followed that immanent criticism by which Life is allowed to criticise itself, it ought now to be easy to establish that, in man, there is a unitary Spirit which shapes itself into various activities and manifestations, each of which is a revelation of the Spirit as a whole, each of which reveals the Spirit through some conquest of the Given, and each of which has for its governing end an Absolute Ideal, and that, through the Unity of the Spirit, these various activities and manifestations are not distinct and independent, but vitally connected and mutually co-operating in the unfolding of the nature of that Spirit, and in the attainment of its one supreme end. To get at a better knowledge of this Spirit, let us begin by an inquiry into the Ideals.

The Absolute Ideal is never before the Spirit as a picture; it itself, while criticising all attempts to shape it, is never shaped or formed. It is ever immanent in the spiritual activity, prompting it to creative effort, inspiring its attempts, praising or condemning the realisation effected, and making possible all further advance. Its force is often more felt in the negative direction than in the positive; the Ought Not is ever more pronounced than the Ought; it is easier to blame than to praise, to destroy than to build up. How to apprehend

it, how to ascertain its demands, and how to make the Spirit's activities comply with them, is the task which awaits the Spirit of man in each manifestation; how to realise it in the given situation, how to shape the Given so as to express it, is the task of each moment and of each separate duty. The Man of the Age is he who can grasp the demands of the Ideal, and can direct the way to their fulfilment; who understands in a given time which particular manifestation will best enable the Spirit to reveal itself, and can command in the attack on the Given; the Man of the Hour is he who, in a critical situation, can see at a glance how the Given can be made subservient to the End striven for. All Progress and all History declare the Ideals to be absolute and timeless: they are supreme for all time, so no time can ever bring them into itself. They are eternal and unchanging, while man's view and realisation of them are ever progressively growing in fulness, beauty, nobility, and truth. In their possession man sees himself uplifted above the seen and the temporal, and learns that the things which are not seen, being spiritual, are eternal. The worker may reach the finest and most perfect embodiment he can; a form which may become the standard of attainment in his own sphere of work for centuries to come; yet he has not fixed the Ideal itself in earthly mould. Above his highest efforts there still floats in peerless beauty, glorious to his dreams though yet unseen, the Ideal he has so long striven after; and to his best work he has

ever to affix the judgment: The best is not yet; the Ideal is not yet attained. Hence a Michael Angelo will spend long days over the finished product of his toil, retouching, refining, making the beauty more beautiful, and the figure more perfect; hence a St. Paul, in the path of moral endeavour and self-surrender to the Divine, will cry out: "I have not yet attained the prize of my high calling in Christ Jesus, but I press on"; and hence a dying Newton will confess: "I have been but as a child picking up a few pretty shells on the shore, while the great ocean of Truth remains unsailed on and unexplored"; while a dying Goethe closes his eyes on the sun, with the murmur: "More Light."

Thus is the Spirit of man placed between the Infinite Ideals and the Given. It has to unfold itself, develop itself, by recognising that its strength, inspiration, and guidance came from the Absolute, and by moulding the Given in accordance with its own Absolute Ends. Man himself is not the Absolute; he cannot create his own Spirit, its modes of manifestation, or the Ideals which are indeed the master lights of all its seeing; but he is called on to create his character, to give content to his Personality, and to develop himself along the lines of an infinite progress. Ideal-realisation, Character-formation, and Given-transformation go hand in hand, and every advance made in any of them is a further and larger view of the infinite possibilities of the Spirit. In every successful embodiment of the Ideal there is a transformation of the Given,

and an enlargement of the Spiritual Life. In the solution of every problem, the removal of every difficulty—whether it be the formation of a satisfactory scientific theory, a fresh advance in Art, a reform in social ways or political institutions, or the conquest of a worry in daily Life—there is a transfiguration of facts through an outburst and outgrowth of the Spirit. It is only the might and glory of the Spiritual which can subdue and transfigure the material and the selfish. In conquering opposition, in subduing Nature, in bringing the Is into conformity with the Ought, man is revealing himself, developing his character, and indubitably manifesting the reality of his spirit. This is sometimes doubted with respect to Natural Science, but the doubt proceeds from a shallow and false view of what Natural Science is. What has been working in Natural Science, subduing Nature to itself, if it be not the Spirit of man? Where is the sphere of Life untouched, unmoved, and undeveloped by the great advance which this century has seen in Natural Science? Is Natural Science a spiritual manifestation, or is it not? If not, the effects its progress has had on Religion, Morality, and Politics are incomprehensible; if it is, they are what must be expected, when the Unity of the Spirit in, and through, all its manifestations is rightly understood.

Man's Spirit grows through work, and without such growth no transformation of the Given, no advance in any manifestation, would be possible. Let the development of the Spirit take place in

any manifestation, and immediately its growing might and growing faith in itself are felt along the lives of all manifestations. He sadly misreads the experience of the past who would assert that any manifestation can exist in isolation; he looks but at the surface of things who would contend that the various spiritual manifestations exist in, and of, themselves, and are not subtly inspirited, grasped, and embraced by the Unity of a Spirit working in, and through, each and all. The Churchmen of the Middle Ages attempted to isolate Religion; some Naturalists of the present day would assert that Natural Science can exist in, and of, itself; but all such attempts at separation are artificial and vain. What God has joined no man can put asunder: can the Spirit create a manifestation, or impose lasting barriers on its development; can it cut itself asunder, and still preserve its Life? What folly it is to talk of any manifestation of the Spirit imposing limitations on any other, or having the right to suppress any other! All the wars for liberty; all the fires by which the martyrs for Truth and Goodness declared that the Spiritual is above the Material; all the persecutions which philanthropist, reformer, inventor, and scientific investigator endured, in order to secure for every manifestation of the Spirit freedom to attain its Absolute End, have indeed been in vain, if man have still to learn that every activity of the Spirit is sacred, and has its sacred mission, that Life in no department is common or unclean, that free

play for every manifestation is the only way to secure the Progress of the whole, and that placing artificial restrictions on any, is the surest way to maim the Life, and to introduce contradiction, discord, and strife. The Spirit of man as rooted in the Absolute is one. Not Reason, not Feeling, not Desire, and not Will; not the Scientific Consciousness, not the Art Consciousness, not the Moral Consciousness, and not the Religious Consciousness, is that Spirit; but all in one unity, in a unity of work and end unparalleled elsewhere, without which, indeed, unity could not exist anywhere for man. Only the Spirit in the Work of Life can declare what are its manifestations; in all, it is revealing by actual word and deed the might and reality of the Spiritual; and in all, it is acknowledging that its true Life consists in an obedience to the Absolute.

It is the enlargement of the Spiritual Life, the development of the Spirit, combined with the fact that the Absolute Ideals can never be completely realised, which explains both how the actualised form of the Ideal becomes unsatisfactory, and how advance is made imperative on man if he will discharge his mission. In the toil of realising the form it has cast for its Ideal, the Spirit grows; and so it finds that the satisfaction of its desire does not satisfy it, that the robes it has woven to clothe itself with, are outgrown before they are long worn. Before it in vision the Absolute Ideal still rises, the goal of its attainments; with its larger strength and increased vision, standing on what it

has already won, it can reach after a fuller and nobler realisation of its end. Thus is man's sufficiency ever somewhat more than he has got; thus is he ever growing into his true self. So, too, no mere material, no so-called earthly pleasure, no amount of riches nor all that riches can afford, can give any real satisfaction to the Spirit of man. Its true home is the Spiritual, and its only true satisfaction is to be found in the realisation of its own Absolute Ends; the attempt to satisfy it with the material, ever issues in the cry of the Preacher: "Vanity of vanities, all is vanity." No more scathing representation of the folly of such an attempt has been given for our reflection than that in the Everlasting Yea of *Sartor Resartus*: "Man's Unhappiness, as I construe, comes of his greatness; it is because there is an Infinite in him, which, with all his cunning, he cannot bury under the Finite. Will the whole Finance Ministers and Upholsterers and Confectioners of Modern Europe undertake, in joint-stock company, to make one shoeblack HAPPY? They cannot accomplish it, above an hour or two: for the Shoeblack also has a Soul quite other than his Stomach; and would require, if you consider it, for his permanent satisfaction and saturation, simply this allotment, no more, and no less: God's *infinite Universe altogether to himself*, therein to enjoy infinitely, and fill every wish as fast as it rose." To the truth of this, every form of Pessimism and every false theory of Life witness; Carlyle here but expresses the teaching of all the spiritual

seers of all the ages, and the experience of all who have risen to see man as a Spirit, and to view Life as the using of the Given and the Material to express the Spiritual; Augustine but casts this truth into the language of Religion, when he says: "Thou hast made man for Thyself, and he cannot rest satisfied till he find his rest in Thee."

Ideals and Needs. Life as we have now been viewing it, unfolds itself before us as the Work for the realisation of Absolute and Infinite Ends, and their embodiment in a Character; but from another point of view we can regard it as the satisfaction of Infinite Needs. While the End remains vague and shadowy, or while no effort is put forth to realise it, there is a restlessness, a dissatisfaction, a hunger, a need of the Spirit. There is a spontaneity of Life not getting vent, activities or manifestations not exercised or developed; and hence the consciousness of suppression, of a wrong done, of a want. If the Spirit of man be as I have described it, then it is plain that, when its growth or development, or effort to realise itself, is cramped or hindered, there must be in its Consciousness unrest and dissatisfaction, and in its Thought, contradiction and discord. It is the presence of such a consciousness in man I here designate a Need. While the whole history of the race can be interpreted as a series of various efforts to satisfy the ever-increasing, ever-multiplying needs of the Spirit, each infinite in its demands and capacity, we must remember ever to take these Needs in indissoluble connection

with the Absolute Ideals. Man's Needs are infinite in their demands, simply because the Ideals to be satisfied are infinite. Were there no such Ideals within him, man would never be conscious of such states as Needs; but when the spontaneity of the Spirit pours forth its energies through its activities and manifestations, the immanent Ideals make their presence felt, and man must thereupon decide to endeavour to realise them, or not. Man could never know the Absolute or Infinite, were the Absolute and Infinite not within him; and when man hungers after the Absolute he is really confessing that, in some way, the Absolute has revealed Himself to the Spirit, and the true nature of the Spirit to itself. This is the argument from Needs in a nutshell. The wail of Pessimism is, as we shall see, the cry of a great hunger of the Spirit, and is utterly unintelligible, if man is but the denizen of time and the creation of the Given. How could the Preacher cry: "Vanity of Vanities, all is Vanity," unless there was a Reality, against which he had weighed the emptiness of his *all*? There can exist no negative which has not a positive for its standing-ground; there can be no comparison effected, if there be but one side known. The gloom which almost invariably follows the acceptance of Materialism, only declares it is shutting out the sunlight of the Spirit; were it the truth for that Spirit, its full knowledge would bring light and liberty to every activity. The presence of contradiction in the Thought bespeaks a Need and an

Absolute Ideal, just as does any state of Unrest; indeed it is such a state itself, and points to an Ideal of Harmony and Unity whose demands must be satisfied. To this state, and the Ideal it is inseparable from, we owe all progress in Science (not merely Natural Science) and in Philosophy.

Man is then called to satisfy his Needs, to realise his Ideals, to subdue the Given, and to build a Character through Work. No past experience, no example of others, and no instruction, can enable him to dispense with his own trials and failures, anxieties and struggles. He must work out his own salvation, believing it is a Higher than himself who guides him; in the sweat of his own brow must he gain the prize of his high calling. Since the immediate end for him is the building of a Character which reveals the Absolute Ends striven for, and bestows a mastery over the Given, and since every element of this Character represents a victory over the Given and over some temptation, and also a satisfaction of a spiritual Need, it is plain that this inner satisfaction involving such victory and mastery, can be the final test of the value of Work. Is unrest driven forth by the gaining of an inner peace, is the strife of contradiction ended through the winning of such a view of things as places all in their right relations, is the man stronger because of victory won, is his faith in himself and in his Ends more confident because of foes routed, and does he know himself a more skilful warrior, a wiser workman, and a shrewder strategist, while

more ready to confess his dependence on powers and guidance not his own — then must there be in his consciousness an assurance of Truth and Reality such as nothing can shake. Let us not be frightened by the bogey of the cry: This is purely subjective, there is no necessary truth in it. A man's Experience must necessarily be his own; but were there not in such an experience common and universal elements supplying the basis of Necessary Truth, the man could not describe it, or if he could, his hearers could not understand him, and this very attempt at the description would indeed be a prolonged utterance in an unknown tongue. The satisfaction we speak of, is that of a Spirit realising an Ideal absolute for all men. Yet must we not think that it is one of abstract reason or of scientific formulæ. The satisfaction of the scientist over the success of his research is not one of mathematical formulæ, or of a lifeless logical machine. His formulæ and tests have indeed all been satisfied, but they have no value in themselves; they are the symbols for inner real demands imposed by the Ideal of Knowledge, and recognised by his conscious Spirit. Let us not commit the serious blunder of substituting the empty formulæ for the vital demands of a living Spirit; let us not place the value of that research and work which have manifested the might of the Spirit, strengthened its activities, and cultivated the finest virtues of the soul, in the satisfaction of abstract tests and conditions, and altogether ignore that inner spiritual Satisfaction of Ideals and

Needs without which the other could not have being.

SEC. III. THE FREEDOM AND SELF-ORIGINATION OF THE SPIRIT.

Freedom and Progress. All one-sided theories, brought face to face with the facts of Human Progress, are found to represent at best but a caricature of the reality. Let us here halt for a moment, and survey the conceptions of Human Progress which have been formed. The *first,* derived from the materialistic account of the evolution of the Universe, explains all by the Atoms, and the Relations between them. It is purely mechanical, destitute of all idea of End, Absolute Authority, or Moral Obligation. That man has such ideas, and that they are operative in his Life, is a sufficient refutation of the pretensions of this conception. The *second* is typified by the growth of a plant, where the final stage is taken as determining the whole process. It may be useful at times to illustrate a particular view of Human Progress, but it cannot truthfully represent it as a whole. For in the plant there is no Consciousness, no notion of End, no sense of Moral Obligation, and no Will; yet these, which are among the distinguishing characteristics of man, are in this conception ignored, and treated as if they made no difference between him and the plants. When will it be understood that a lower cannot explain a higher, if lower and higher receive

their full signification; and when will it be understood that, since man has in him the conceptions of End, Duty, Love, and Work, there must be ascribed to him that which no mere material or organic conception can embrace? To account for Human Progress, a *third* and widely different conception must be framed: that of man as a Spirit, drawing sustenance from faith in Absolute Ideals which are his guides, ever growing only through obedience to them, and taking every step onward by virtue of his own free choice. Let us survey the facts in order to support this.

Progress almost invariably starts with the individual, and proceeds slowly, winning individual by individual among the mass of men. Its pioneers have to fight for the truth of their position against the strenuous, the selfish, and the malignant opposition of the upholders of old forms and the *status quo*.

These pioneers ever profess faith in the Ideal which leads them on, and ever proclaim that man is free to accept or reject that which they declare is the Truth.

Not only is this proclamation and affirmation on the part of the teachers of the race inexplicable on any other basis than that of its truth, but the very demand for progress can be due only to spiritual discernment, spiritual growth, and spiritual freedom. No Given, no Environment, could give to the Social Reformer the vision of the Larger Life whose realisation he works for. Had his own Spirit not already

leaped beyond the Environment, the Given, he could neither know of, nor demand, the change; were there not in him that which persuades him that the Ideal is the truly Real, he would never have that Faith which enables him to endure "hatred, scoffing, and abuse," to secure the reform; and if the Spirits of those he works for, did not themselves desire the change, and so show themselves capable of Progress, the alteration of the outer circumstances would be of no avail to lift them up. Men are spoiled if they get the fruits of a spiritual advance without having undergone its travail. The Goths knew not what else to do with the art treasures of Rome than to use them for rubble-stones and fire-lights; the natives of India cannot be allowed to govern themselves till they prove themselves capable of so doing; the child given gunpowder will probably blow himself up. Over us in every department of activity, before our every step, the Ideals are presiding, confronting us, and calling for our allegiance, but they are only spiritually discerned and spiritually obeyed. If such discernment and freedom to obey or disobey be not in us, then we may be automata in the hands of *forces*, *tendencies*, or *movements*, but we are not human beings capable of resisting temptation, or able to take one step on the road of Human Progress.

The problems, responsibilities, and temptations of Work confirm our position. The work of each day pours in upon us in a succession of problems; new situations have to be faced, and fresh questions,

unexpected, have to be answered in a moment. But it is just in all this that our duty lies, and here we are to play the man, or fail. Not only by our successes, but by our failures, may we learn where Truth lies and how it is to be attained; for the consciousness of failure implies some knowledge of that which has been missed. So every moment and every act come with a moral choice from which there is no escape; whether we will or not, we cannot escape the responsibility of decision; and though we make all our decisions in secret, in the day of public or of friendly duty and of social reform they are proclaimed from the housetop, and the character we have been building beneath the waters, stands revealed to all men's eyes.

Only by granting Free Will to man can we account for the aberrations and retrogressions in his so-called evolution. How came the Greeks to reach such a pinnacle of intellectual greatness, and then to sink into such inglorious weakness and ineptitude? How, if not that they, of their own free will, put Self in place of the Absolute, and so, losing faith in themselves and their Work, became the prey of Doubt, of Scepticism, and of debasing Appetite?

In confirmation of this we have the errors and sins, avoidance of error, and reformation, of the individual. Were man moved forward on the path of his development by the working of natural[1] forces within or without, as is the plant, no such facts would meet us in the survey of Human Life. That

[1] Used purely in a physical or biological sense.

man does err, is the warning of every branch of Knowledge and Industry; that man can avoid Error, and that it is his duty to do so, is the declaration of Natural Science, as of Morality; that man can fall into Error unconsciously and consciously, and that he can turn from his Error to the ways of Truth, from his Sins to the path of Holiness, is the testimony of all Progress, religious or other. To give as an explanation of such facts, that man is moved here by the force of new facts, is, even if we allow the use of *force* here, to overlook the main fact in any change of view: the presence of an eye to see the facts as they are. If there were no change in the Spirit of man, how could there arise a new view of the facts? If, since the dawn of Time, air waves and ether waves have been causing the same vibrations and tremors in the nerves of man, whence comes the developmental changes in the modes of viewing them? All History goes to show that man cannot be made to see what he will not: Christ Himself could not cause the Pharisees to see the truth of His message. Social reformation and personal holiness were indeed an easy matter, did mere facts, of themselves, bring man from Error to Truth, and from Vice to Virtue.

Determinism. At first sight Determinism seems to receive great support from the influence exerted on the individual by the past and by society. But we should remember that this influence is no mechanical relation; it is a relation, not of material bodies, but of Spirits, in which the receiver must

exert his own activities as much as the giver exerts his; and possible only because of the Absolute in the Spirit of man. Were there not in the Spirit of the child the recognition of authority, and the innate trust and belief that those around him are formed like himself, and have learned something good for him to know, all possibility of teaching him or training him into a member of society would be at an end. And this recognition, trust, and belief, however unconsciously at first exercised, imply, especially when they are consciously apprehended, the Reality of an Authority which can guide and govern the Spirit to the attainment of its own ends. Hence is it, that all true Education aims at enabling the learner to search for, and know, Truth for himself, and hence is it, that it lays so much stress on the training of the Will—the child is to be trained to submit himself, not to an arbitrary authority, but to one which governs for his good, and in whose spirit he is enabled to recognise the presence of another Authority, higher, perfect, over himself and all men. No doubt, the innate trust of the child in the guidance of others is often grievously deceived, but this in nowise detracts from the force of my contention. The authority which deceives and betrays, ever pretends to be that which it is not, thus at bottom proclaiming the truth we contend for. Children are often blighted before and after birth by the misdeeds and sins of parents and elders, and one is often inclined to say: They are determined to evil both by their birth and their

surroundings; but that they are without freedom, without the possibility of knowing, appreciating, and loving the Good or some good, all the facts of their Lives, and all the facts in the history both of social reform and religious work among them, utterly and incontestably disprove. To prove the opposite, it would be necessary to show that they have no consciousness of an Ought as distinct from an Is; no obedience to any spiritual authority, and so, no Truth, no Goodness, no Art, and no Love; that they are destitute of the possibility of Progress; and that no act and no moment ever present a choice between a higher and a lower end.

Self-origination. Many errors which opponents of Free Will fall into, would be avoided were they to remember that every influence of Authority, every form in which Authority is embodied—social customs, public opinion, educational systems, political institutions, and personal influence—is nothing in and of itself, but has its force because of the Spiritual in it; is but a form of the Given by which the Spirit expresses the realisation of its ends; and that it, too, must undergo transformation with the growth of the Spirit. Even as the Spirits of men have created the forms of their Authority, so must the successive generations, of their own free will, re-create these forms from age to age. To this transformation and re-creation all the members of every society are called. We speak nowadays of the forces of natural environment, the forces of authority, and the forces of social

institutions, as if these were living active agents, able to mould men at their will, and were the only inciting, moving, and directing forces at work in the Progress of man. In this loose way we speak of the effects of Climate on the formation of National Character; of the changes introduced into our economic conditions by the Black Death, and by the Introduction of Labour-Saving Machinery; and of the discoveries of Natural Science causing Religion to abandon many of its beliefs, and to modify many of its fundamental conceptions. The temptation to forget that these are brief modes of speech, and that the only agent in each and all is the Spirit of man, becomes to many an easy pitfall. Do Climatic Conditions affect man as the wind the sand, laying it now here and now there? The Climate may present peculiar difficulties to man's Progress, and so may lead to particular developments of the Spirit's activities, but these are the results of the Spirit's endeavour to attain its own Ends. Let it be agreed that, if the Climate had not been there, they would not have taken on the shape they assumed; let it be further agreed that, were there no Given, there could be no Character for man as we now conceive it; but this is not to say that Climate, or any Given, has any force, any living vital influence, to incite, direct, or determine man's Progress. Up from the depths of the Spirit's spontaneity well the only forces which can ever move the Spirit; the inspiration and strength necessary for the advance come from faith in the Absolute Ideals, while the successive

forms which represent the stages, are due to the particular Given. In the movement towards the goal of his Social Ideal, the time came when man saw that the relation between Serf and Lord was an inadequate expression for that Ideal, that it no longer gave the Spirit room to develop, and that to hold by it longer was only to cramp and injure the Life of man. The Black Death may have enabled man to see all this somewhat sooner than he might otherwise have done, but had he not had the eyes to see, and had he not grown far beyond his old stature, could he have seen that the suit of political and social relations no longer fitted? Were man not a living Spirit, reaching out towards, and endeavouring to embody, Absolute Ideals, what effect could the Black Death or any other event have on his development? So with the other example cited, and with all such examples—the language in which they are couched, is based on a false and pernicious view of Life. The sooner its inadequacy to explain and its perversion of the facts are exposed, and the sooner men open their eyes to see that Life is a Unity, and that man is a Spiritual Being, the sooner shall we be able to secure a lasting foothold for every Science and every Industry, and clearly to see that no one activity or manifestation, no one Science and Industry, can stand alone, but that all need all the others, and that all together form the true rounded whole of Life.

Up from the mysterious and unplummeted depths of the Spirit well the fountains of Spiritual

Life. Man does not create them, but as consciousness grows within him, he has to apprehend the true Ends of their activities and guide their force and working so that these may be attained. Take Thinking itself, and must we not agree with Sigwart "that, with the development of conscious life, Thought arises *involuntarily* and of necessity"? "As soon," he continues, "as the individual begins to reflect upon his inner activity, he finds that he is already engaged in various kinds of Thought; he can have no immediate knowledge of its beginning nor of its development out of simpler and more primitive activities . . . Moreover, the involuntary production of thoughts continues throughout our whole life . . ."[1] When brought into contact with the spontaneous flow of Life in children, ever changing as to its ends and purposes, when we endeavour to educate them till they come to those years when conscious manhood or womanhood bursts in upon them, and Ideals of unrealised possibilities whisper solicitingly to leave the old teachers and come and follow them, and they will bestow the Wisdom of Plato, the Poetry of Shakespeare, the Riches of Eldorado, and the Triumphs of Alexander; and when we survey the history of the race, observe how the Spirit has burst out, now in one direction, now in another, and try to understand how a nation awakes from a sleep of lethargic conservatism and rouses itself to a fresh career of development and triumphs,—either we must attribute

[1] *Logic*, Eng. transl., p. 2.

to man a Spirit which progresses only through its own act, guided by Absolute and Infinite Ideals immanent in its activities, or we must say that Progress comes to him apart from his self-consciousness, his knowledge, and his will, and that it arises out of nowhere and is proceeding towards nowhither. Against the latter view all the facts of Life and History protest. The astronomer can map the heavens, and predict the relative positions of the heavenly bodies centuries ahead; the physicist can predict the condition of the earth as to its heat a billion years to come; but what knowledge of the child can enable us to predict what he will become? Do not the spontaneity and the freedom of choice implied in his personality defy all attempts at such prediction? Are not all attempts to suppress any manifestation of the Spirit but the endeavour to break the wheels of Time? Can a strong personality be limited by the customs and ways of the past, or restrained from bursting forth along its own lines? It is vain to imprison a youthful Pascal so that he may not learn Geometry, or to confine a youthful Giotto within the bounds of a sore poverty, and think that his genius for Art will not burst through all such bonds. Tell these that the movements of their spirits are wrong, wicked, and opposed to their true welfare; they but laugh, and assert that they are true, holy, for their highest good, and for the glory of God. They know they are true or their whole Life is a lie, that they are of God or nothing is. Who can mistake the spon-

taneity of Life, and the buoyant boyish faith which mark the birth of a new era, be it brought in by the scholars of Italy, the Sea-Dogs of England, the Cromwellian Ironsides, the Street-preaching Methodists, or the British Colonists settling new continents? In these, as in the case of the individual, it is the development the whole Life undergoes through the new faith, obedience, and work, which attests the Truth and Reality of the manifestation of the Spirit. But no reading of History can enable us to foretell the future. Where will the next forward movement be made? Will it be religious, social, or a continuation of the present advance in Natural Science? Who can answer these questions? We attempt it, and the facts afterwards come, to laugh at our childish efforts. We are called on to see ourselves as Spirits, and to have faith in the leading which is given to us in the activities of those Spirits; we are called on to profit by all the experience of the past, to despise no movement of the Spirit which has made for the welfare and development of man, and to see in every duty which comes to our hand, the real means to reveal ourselves, attain our Ends, and behold Reality.

SEC. IV. REALITY.

Preliminary View. We are now in a position to answer the first of the great questions with which we set out, namely: What is meant by Reality?

If we ask the question of Pessimism: "What

profit hath a man of all his labour which he taketh under the sun?" the Preacher of old gives the answer: "Therefore I hated life, because the work that is wrought under the sun is grievous unto me: for all is vanity and pursuit of wind."[1] And if we further inquire: What is the ground for the assertion that all is vanity? the Preacher is ready with the answer: There is nothing permanent; there is nothing that gives abiding satisfaction; there is nothing that justifies a man in being wise, in amassing knowledge or wealth, or in labouring for an end; for there is no real Progress, no abiding End; and Death ends all. The Preacher is too religious not to contradict himself over and over again in his pages. He is unconscious alike that his "Fear God and keep His commandments" contradicts the view of Life from which his pessimistic wail issues, and that Pessimism implies a fundamental contradiction, which is destructive to it. Stated without self-contradiction, the complaint of Pessimism amounts to this: Nothing can satisfy a Spirit but the Spiritual; nothing can satisfy a Spirit with the sense of the Infinite within it but an Infinite and Abiding Perfection. From the Pessimist, however, we have gained some characteristics of Reality: Spirituality, Permanence, its knowledge and conscious possession, give lasting peace, joy, and satisfaction, and enable man to distinguish between the true and the false, the good and the evil. Were we to inquire of Scepticism, it would probably agree,

[1] Ecclesiastes ii. 17.

that, if there be a Reality, it must have these features. Going to the various manifestations and inquiring of them, we get these marks with others added, till the test of Reality issues as :—That which must be, in order that the work of Life can be shown as the effort to manifest it and realise it, or to deny it ; in order that Life can be exhibited free of self-contradictions, and that Progress can be shown in its unity, and as a series of attempts, ever growing in clearness, exactness, and fulness, to grasp it and body it forth ; and in order that the distinctions in judgments without which intercourse and society would be impossible, may have a lasting basis on which to rest. Or, briefly : That which must be, which enduringly is, in order that Life, as we know it, may be possible. If this is the test which all men must either subscribe to, or cover themselves with contradiction and confusion, it must be accepted. It is no valid objection to it to assert that the only Reality it can give assurance of, is a Reality involved and implied in all men's thinking, doing, and conscious Life. This is the only Reality Life can reveal; of any other there can be neither speech, thought, nor imagination.

Combining what has just been said with the data supplied by the foregoing sections, we are in a position to answer the question : What must be affirmed Real ?

1. The Spirit of man, which manifests itself in various ways, yet holds all its manifestations and acts in one living vital connection or unity. This

Unity, usually termed The Unity of Consciousness, is one of the most sublime facts in the Life of man. Before its piercing eye every false theory of Life stands convicted of self-contradiction, and then must slink shamefacedly away. To account for the great facts of Life, there must be ascribed to the Spirit spontaneity of energy, freedom of choice, and the presence of Absolute Ideals.

2. The Supreme Reality which man must believe in and know, if he is to believe in, and know, himself, and is to give an adequate explanation of the Absolute Ideals. This Reality, known in Philosophy by the title, The Ultimate Ground of All That Is, is, in Religion, known as God. Man, being Spirit and being led forward by Ideals which furnish the true ends of that Spirit, *cannot but believe* that the Source of his being, the Guide of his Progress, and the Life and Light of his Life, are Spirit also. All Religions which have reached any high development, are witnesses to this.

Before entering into a further survey of the facts of Life in order to establish and confirm the position here laid down, let us note that it is only this basis of Life which can save man from the loss of Personality implied in Pantheism, or the swooning into nothingness implied in extreme Mysticism. Whatever may be the view of Reality which gives Pantheism its hold on human Thought, a slight examination is sufficient to point out objections to its acceptance. If God be the All, and the All be God, whence come, and what are, Error and Sin?

Moreover, this system of Pantheism is my view of Reality; it is the Truth for me. But how, if God be the All and the All be God, can there be the distinction between Truth and Error? Besides, what am I, who thus think? If I have no Reality, no Personality, what is the value of my Thought? If God be thinking in me thus viewing the All, and thinking in another thinker also viewing it, and the resulting views and theories are different, what must we think of God, or which theory are we to believe? If I am confident that I am right, and that the other thinker, equally honest in his intentions and careful in his observations and deductions, is wrong, the only ground I can base my conviction on, is the knowledge that God is in me, but not in him. But he is of the All, then there is a part of the All God is not in—a contradiction to the original statement. Or if God is only in me, am I God? But we need not pursue the maze further, only to lose ourselves in giddy turnings and bewildering confusions. The swoon of extreme Mysticism is the abandonment of Consciousness, and the surrender of all that constitutes Spirit. What man would be were he other than he is, or what he can know when his Personality is lost and he sinks into or swoons into an Infinite Consciousness, which to him is blank Unconsciousness, neither the mystic can tell us, nor can we ever learn. Any sound theory will take man as he is, with all his spiritual endowments, with all his modes of action, with the Unity of his Consciousness, and with the

Freedom of his Will, which, though it compels us to look fairly at the hideousness of his Sin, also proudly calls us to look at the Progress made, and the nobility and grandeur of the earnest workers of the race, and which, whatever be man's fall, is the assurance that he can rise into newness of Life, and into the possession of a goodness, a truth, and a joy which are everlasting.

Reality is given us in the Spirit and through its Ideals. Only a spiritual interpretation of Life can yield Reality. There can be but two interpretations of Life : the spiritualistic and the naturalistic. Our examination of the forms of the latter showed how superficial, misleading, and contradictory they are. Our later analysis of the facts of Life has revealed that only the former can give their full value to these facts, and can account, not only for the existence of themselves, but of the naturalistic theories they oppose. We have now further to interrogate these facts and to hear them all proclaim : Reality can never be found in the Given.

Progress. Progress, as we have found, is among the most indubitable facts of Life. It, as we have seen before, implies an End, an End believed to be worthy of attainment, and an End in whose realisation man finds his true development and continued satisfaction. This is the belief which nerves all man's efforts, and supports him in the midst of severest trials. The belief in question is no mere speculation, no product of dreams or fancies or

assumptions founded on hearsays, no mere matter of custom, no opinion self-formed, or formed somehow, without anyone knowing how, and handed down by tradition or transmitted by heredity; it is a fundamental postulate of Thought, of Work, and of Progress; it is inherent in the Spirit's Consciousness when the Spirit is truly developing. If Work and Progress are affirmed to be Real, the postulate or basis on which they rest must surely be Real; or what do they rest on? and if they are affirmed the revelation of the Real, then their basis has the same rest or foundation in the Real as they themselves have. Let us not trifle with words when we are dealing with the serious facts of Life; but let us penetrate to the true significance of the facts which they represent. Progress then implies an End, an End Absolute in its guidance of that Progress, seeing that it approves or condemns every step taken in it; One and Unchanging, since it gives unity to the whole advance, and to all its successive stages; Infinite, seeing that, however attained, however realised, it remains an infinite conception, whose full content man in Time can never know; and Perfect, seeing that its realisation in progressive forms, yields satisfaction to all the needs of man's manifold activities in the successive stages of his development. Now the Given, the Sense-Experienced, the Realised, the Material in any form, cannot give this End; it would be self-contradictory to affirm it. The End itself, too, is ever refusing to allow itself to be classed with the Given; it is ever

calling man to see Reality, not in What Is, but in What Has Still To Be; and is ever pronouncing the Given an impostor, when it would call man to see the Real in the Is, and to rest from labour in careless ease. The End therefore is; it must be, or Progress cannot be. It can be only in, and have Reality only for, the Spirit. But if Progress is affirmed a revelation of the Real, the End striven for and embodied in it must be the supreme revelation, and the Spirit which apprehends this, strives for it, and realises it in its own formations, must be Real.

Work. As we have noted before, Life is not the drawing of conclusions according to Euclidean axioms and definitions; it is not spent in abstract reasoning; but it is the setting-up of ends deemed good, the problems and perplexities which arise in the realisation of these, the attempts at their solution, the judgments passed on the concrete ends and actions as good or bad, true or false, the hopes and fears attendant on such a progress, a spiritual communion with one's fellow-workers, a war against the temptations which would set up the Given for the Real, and Self for the Absolute, and the helps and hindrances which come from the realised forms of the Ideal, and the spiritualistic or selfish view our fellows take of these. Work, as we use it, includes every putting forth of spiritual energy; it includes thinking, imagining, feeling, and willing, when these are being used seriously—of the Work of Error and Sin we shall speak again. Wherever contra-

diction is resolved, discord brought into harmony, opposition to progress met or vanquished—there Work is being done. Work has no Reality in itself, or apart from the Spirit working. When we call it Real, we mean that in it the Spirit manifests itself and its superiority over the Given. The Work of a man, indeed, lives after him; but it can have neither power nor influence on others, if there is not on their part an apprehension and appreciation of the Spiritual Ends embodied in it, and the setting of their Spirits in the attitude of endeavouring to realise the same Ends. Our Education is determined for us by the attainments of the past; our Ideals take shape through their achievements; but they do not form themselves mechanically before the eye of our Imagination, or shape themselves apart from our own action. We must first, by the exercise of all our spiritual activities, realise what our fathers have done, and grow up to the fulness of their stature, and then by strenuous endeavour must we carry on their labours to completion. There can be no influence, no training, no development apart from Work; and everywhere and at all times it implies the putting forth of spiritual energies, and the directing of them to realise Absolute Ends. There is no grasp of Truth, no apprehension of Reality, if Work is not done. When a man finds his Work, he finds, as Carlyle has so clearly seen, his own development; and in this he is so assured of the Reality of his Spirit and of the worth of the ends he is gaining, that Doubt or Despair cannot

find a single darkened corner in his mind to harbour in; for the light of the Sun of Truth is flooding with noonday brightness its remotest chambers.

Those who deny the Spiritual in man, or who fail to give it its full significance, deny any spiritual implications to Work, and account for certain conquests of the Spirit as purely fictitious. They contend that the temptations which assail the Spirit are either imaginary or entirely of man's own making; that the victory over degraded habits, which Religion or a Spiritual View of Life enables a man to win, is erroneously ascribed to any superhuman or spiritual source; and that the overcoming of Sorrow, Loss, Death itself, so that they become aids to the development of the Spirit, is but a subterfuge of the Imagination. They thus gravely assert that men, in the most critical moments of existence, blind themselves to the realities of Life, hoax themselves by a false belief, and then, with unconscious or unblushing mendacity, endeavour to foist it on their fellows as the most sublime of truths. The monstrous egotism, the unverified assumption of the mendacity of our fellow-men, and the artificial and mistaken conception of Mind, conveyed by this contention, may be left to refute themselves. One word more on another implication which underlies the position; this is: The Artificial and Imaginary can overcome the Real. Now by Imagination a man can dream he does much, but we have never known any serious work done, or development gained, by such dreaming. After every victory

over temptation, after every view which enables a man to take up the experience of Sorrow and Loss into the upbuilding of his Character, a man knows himself stronger; and he proves it by withstanding greater temptations and by self-sacrificing works. Yet we are asked to believe that the man dreams himself into this added strength. But this is a self-contradiction, for added strength is no dream. Sorrow, Loss, Doubt, and Despair are not surmounted by any wishing or dreaming; if this were possible, what a dream Life would be! They, as all temptations, are truly overcome, and Life is again harmonised, only by a spiritual view which enables the Spirit to see where Reality is to be found. But this experience which I have called a VIEW, is no glance of Imagination; it is an act of spiritual insight, bespeaking a spiritual growth, and is as truly a spiritual experience as that which is overcome. Sorrow, Loss, Doubt, and Temptation are nothing, apart from a Spirit experiencing them all; they are real experiences for it; and hence that which overcomes them is a real work of the Spirit. If there cannot be action apart from an actor, if there cannot be activity without something putting it forth, if there cannot be experience without something to experience it, if there cannot be added strength and development without something growing, then Work everywhere proclaims a Spirit working, establishes the might of that Spirit over the Given, and cannot abide any theory which would make of that Spirit the name for a blank

of emptiness, in which thoughts, beliefs, temptations, and experiences come and go, the fugitive existences of a dream.

The Continued Presence of Temptation in Man. In some accounts of man's Progress originating from the Evolutionary School, it is maintained that, since Sin, Error, and the Weakness which causes man to fall, are but the remains of the brute within him, he will, in the course of his Evolution, gradually lose these brute elements, and rise into a Life where even the term Duty will be unknown, because he will do what is right without questioning, delay, or thinking otherwise. A beautiful dream no doubt, but still a dream! It is based on wrong conceptions of Progress and Work, and it is unsupported by the facts of Life and History. No one has ever yet been able to prove that Sin and Error are *brute* elements, for, so far as is known, the animals know nothing of Error or Sin. Nor has any Evolutionary School been able to establish that man is freer from temptation now than he was in the dawn of his History. Do not all the facts go to prove that, with every step man takes, a fresh temptation awaits him? As Life becomes more complicated, as duties increase, do not temptations increase in the same proportion, and do they not appear in still subtler forms? Will any form of intellectual education, will a sound moral training, will the environment of a good home, save a youth entering his life-work from temptations, or, of themselves, prevent him from falling? What is the

answer of parents and teachers everywhere? The conception of the Progress of the man given by this theory would destroy its unity, and, were it true, we at the present time could not understand the spiritual experiences of the men of a bygone age. What could we know of temptations which never come to us, or of the situations once so perplexing, but now unknown? But we are one with our fathers; the human Spirit remains identical through the ages in this: that it must at every step choose between a right and a wrong, and that it cannot advance except of its own free will. Nay, even as the Ideals striven for remain the same, though the forms of their embodiment are so different, so the temptations which beset the hearts of men preserve an identity throughout the ages. Were our position false, how could it be accounted for that the Psalms of David have remained for over two thousand years the utterances of the religious experiences of the successive generations? Why is it that every sincere prayer spoken by Mexican or Peruvian worshipper, or uttered of old by the banks of Indus, Nile, or Euphrates, breathes our own aspirations, joy, remorse, shame, or cries for help; why is it that Doubt and Despair haunt generation after generation; why is it that, since the earliest records of religious story, Agnosticism, Scepticism, and Atheism have been forms of Belief; why does the future still loom so dark, why does Life still bring such perplexing problems, why does Duty part us at times from those we

love, and why does obedience to the Right often entail pain, weariness, and loneliness to the Heart? *Why*, if not that man is a Spirit gifted with Free Will, guided by Absolute Ideals, and called on to manifest his Reality by the conquest of the Given, and the building of a Character; every element of the latter being gained at the cost of free choice and a real effort against opposition? The theory which deludes man into believing that temptation is growing less subtle or less destructive, is blinding him to the facts of Life, and the nature of Work and Growth, and is surely leading him to his ruin.

Difficulty, Doubt, Despair. If we ask: Why does man chafe at difficulties, the only adequate explanation is: It is because his Spirit, through its Ideals, is conscious of a Beyond to which the difficulty bars the way. Were there not in man something more than the mere Given, were Sense-Experience all, how would man be able to know or name the Difficulty as such? What, again, are Doubt and Despair but spiritual temptations, attitudes or states in which the Spirit of man can place itself, but impossible to it were it not conscious of its own greatness, and capable of free act? Only a free Spirit can be tempted; only such a Spirit whose mission is the attainment of Absolute and Infinite Ends, can progress and can fall or go astray; and only such a Spirit can doubt as to the means taken to attain its end, its present position, or the correctness of the concrete representation of the End which has been set up for present attainment. Were

man determined as to all he does, how could he possibly doubt? And if man go farther along the road of Doubt till he find himself in the grip of Despair, what does this darkness and agony imply, if it be not a Spirit which has missed its way? In this state of consciousness there is the implication of a road missed, of an end unattained, of a heritage withheld. Although the Spirit by its own free act may have identified itself with the Given, and may deny there is a Spiritual, yet it refuses to be content with the Given. Indignantly in such a state does man cry out against his lot, reproachfully does he protest against God, even while denying there is a God, for having made him so. Identify himself as he may with the material and the Given, man cannot believe himself the creature of chance, and the sport of circumstance; there is that in him which causes him to protest against, and deny, the rationality and credibility of that theory which he had set up for Absolute Truth. No theory of Life which denies to man a Spirit such as we have ascribed to him, can account for the phenomena which Doubt and Despair present.

In like manner Pessimism, by its very existence and in its every utterance, contradicts the theory of Materialism or Agnosticism on which it professedly bases itself. If man *cannot be* content, or, adopting the milder statement, if he *is not* content, with Life as he views it, what does this imply other than there is an element in Life not comprehended by his pessimistic view? Or, at least, that the side

which supplies the contrast, is not presented in the view taken? Every cry of the Pessimist is that of a Spirit dimly conscious of its own greatness and absolute worth, but unable clearly to see and know this because of the wrappings of the Seen and the Given. It declares these visible coverings to be the whole of Life, and, with the same breath, affirms that they are not satisfactory to the Spirit of man. Thus, like other false theories which in word deny to man his true spiritual Life, it rests on such a Life for its own existence and understanding. When man opens his eyes to see this, when he sees that it is the presence of the Absolute and Infinite within him which causes his discontent, then he has faith in himself, faith in his destiny, strength for present duty, and hope for future victory, and he ariseth as from a sleep disturbed by evil dreams, to behold the glory of the Absolute Spirit beautifying and making holy every domain of Life.

Sorrow and Loss. These are, like Difficulty and Doubt, prophets of the Spirit crying out to man in the wilderness of Life: Know thyself as Spirit and learn thy true Destiny. We sorrow for our wrong-doing only because there is a consciousness within us of an Absolute Ideal we have wronged, and an Absolute Reality whose laws we have violated, and because that consciousness makes us aware that in obedience to them or it lies our true Life. We sorrow over wrong done to us, because it is our Ideals which are desecrated, it is the Absolute who is defied. Unrighteous Sorrow will be angry because

Self has suffered hurt, but Righteous Sorrow regards only the sacredness of the Ideals of Truth, Beauty, Love, and Goodness, and of the Absolute Presence they reveal, and cares not for Self. Anger on their behalf is righteous; war on their behalf is true self-preservation. Sorrow for men blind to their true interests, unheeding the call of the Ideals, is ever the lot of the reformer and the philanthropist. He will sacrifice all Self holds dear, if thereby the Ideal is set up in its right place in the Lives of men. Could Death itself have the same significance, did it not make us at least dimly conscious that the Spirit of man is not his body, that it is not caught in the meshes of Time, but ever, while working in Time, affirms itself timeless? Nay, Time itself were an impossible conception for man were there not in him the changeless and the eternal. It is the very reality of our Loss which brings home to us the Reality of our own Spirits, and of the Spirit of him who has been taken from us; and this carries with it the Reality of that Presence who reveals Himself in us by the Absolute Ideals. For the Spirit has no value or Reality in itself apart from these, and therefore none apart from that Spirit whom they indicate and make us aware of. Thus do we come to see the abiding Reality of Friendship, and the immortality of our friend; for if the Spirit be real, and yet ever dependent on the Absolute and Infinite Spirit, how can any change in the Given deprive it of existence, or how can that which has been made in the likeness of the Absolute,

whose mission it is to strive after His perfection, and in whom the Absolute Himself would fain see Himself reflected by its own self-determined act, pass away and come to nought as the flower of the earth or the beast of the field?

Sin. The voice of Sin, as that of the experiences connected therewith—Remorse and Repentance—is not less loud in its proclamation of the Reality of the Spirit and the authority of its Ideals. On a Naturalistic view of Life these experiences are either shorn of their significance, or explained as illusions. Strange trifling, this, with the most serious moments of man's existence, which will call delusions those experiences in which man hears the voice of a Higher Spirit within him, and in which, obeying this, he passes through the portals of a new birth into a life of Righteousness, Peace, and Holiness! Naturalism has yet to explain how, on its basis, such a change is possible, or how out of an illusion or delusion there springs a Life of Self-sacrifice. So long as there is in man the consciousness of Sin, the pangs of Remorse, and the beauteous day-dawn of Repentance, so long must the Life of man present enigmas insoluble by any theory of Naturalism or Rationalism. Nor need we pause to discuss how impotent to explain the facts is any theory which accounts for these experiences by fear of the laws of man; as well might we say that in them man is afraid of himself. Man undergoes Remorse for sins with which the laws of his fellows have nought to do; his own emphatic

testimony at such a time has ever been, that he has sinned against a Higher than man, against the supreme Highest; and the Life which follows true Repentance not only manifests the Reality of the Spirit, but is a continuous declaration that that Spirit finds its true Life in obedience to an authority which is Spiritual and Absolute for all men.

Reality of Evil. The Sin of man, and the misery it entails on himself and others, cannot be blinked; we have found it too strong for the systems of Abstract Idealism and Pantheism to grapple with. This question, then, must now be faced: If the Spirit of man is Real when obeying its Absolute Ideals, is it also Real when disobeying them? When we rightly conceive what is the nature of the Human Spirit—that none of its acts would have any meaning, if any possibility, apart from an Absolute Ideal to which they must refer—we begin to understand the argument of Descartes, that man can neither call himself into being, nor sustain himself in being, and that, therefore, there must be a Being, greater than himself, who does both. Then, too, we see how all our acts have reference to an Ultimate Reality, who is Absolute Spirit, through which reference they possess the Reality we ascribe to them. They reveal the Real, therefore there must be a Supreme Reality whom they reveal, and a real Spirit of like nature to whom the revelation is made. Let their revelation be denied; it can be shown that this very denial is self-contradictory. Who, then, shall

say that the Human Spirit is not immortal, not Real; or that the Infinite Love which so encompasses it, will not one day be able to bring the erring Spirit so to see itself that it will, of its own free will, turn from its error and wickedness and truly live?

Every act of man, then, has reference to an Absolute Ideal. Through this it has its Reality, its Truth or Falsehood, Good or Evil. Sin, therefore, has no Reality of itself; it is the act of a free Spirit knowing the good and doing it not, of that Spirit refusing to love the Absolute Spirit, who, through its supreme Ends, is ever desiring to win it to Himself. Sin is not of the Ultimate Nature of things. We can see this, in the *first place*, if we regard the truth already expressed: It is not through Sin we get our notion of Goodness, but it is because Goodness is, that Sin can be; in other words, not Sin but Goodness is the Ultimate notion; or, put still differently, Sin is what it is because it is the transgression of an Absolute End of Goodness. There can be Goodness without Sin, but there cannot be Sin without Goodness; just as there cannot be Hypocrisy without a Truth which it simulates, but Truth is, whether the Hypocrisy is or not. We see it, in the *second place*, when we regard the professions of Error and Sin. The Spirit in these never gives them out for what they are, but for what they are not. A Lie is never set forth as a lie; a slander does not proclaim that part or all of the truth is hidden by it; Opposition to Progress and Persecution of the Reformers have

ever professed to be inspired by the highest motives. It is this which makes Sin so subtly pernicious, so difficult to oppose or suppress, and so serpent-like in its enticements. Were the liar, the slanderer, the hypocrite, and the selfish to proclaim themselves as they are, they would convict themselves out of their own mouths, and all would know how to deal with them; but they are masked in the countenance of Truth, and disguised in the robes of Righteousness, and an alert watchfulness and a trained discernment are necessary for the detection of the imposture. We see it, in the *third place,* in the uneasy consciousness of those who have done wrong, and in the presence of Remorse and Repentant Sorrow in the heart of man. A man for many years, perhaps for his lifetime, may, through a false education or an ill-advised regard for the achievements of the Past, mistake the Form for the Spirit, the Attained for the Attainable, and may thus have his views of Truth and Reality distorted. Of such a one we have here nothing to say; the movement of Progress, through the efforts of earnest workers, will awaken him or his followers to see the error of his ways, and will demand a decision for or against the Right. What we are here concerned with is Sin consciously committed, or the awakening to see Error which has been regarded as Truth. In these cases, such as that of the writer of the fifty-first Psalm, or of St. Paul arrested to compare Christianity with Pharisaism aright, there is no doubt as to the Spirit's condemnation of, or judgment

on, its past act. It is pronounced to be a transgression of a law higher than that of man, and an opposition to One to whom the Spirit owes a loving and entire obedience in all its powers. And we see it, in the *fourth place*, when we come to look at the permanence of Evil. If Evil be in the Nature of Things, then, as many have done, must we accept it as coeval and coeternal with the Good. But where in any nation whose people make the profession of loving Truth and doing Right, and where public opinion is kept sweet and pure by a number of virtuous souls maintaining the Ideals and leavening the mass, will Evil flaunt its garments in open daylight, unabashed and unashamed? Where is the community which has ever rested on a basis of falsehood and vice? Where is the Error which has not had to skulk away before the light of Truth, or where the Evil which has not been trampled into dust under the feet of earnest workers whose hearts were aglow with the fire of consuming love and goodness? The history of the race declares that only Truth and Righteousness are eternal. The Evolutionary School itself proclaims the triumphant faith which ever nerves the true workman—the invincible conviction that, in the end, Good will be everywhere victorious. Many of the great Religions of the World give distinct utterance to this; and none of them announces primeval chaos, fiendish strife, and eternal misery as the final end and consummation of all things. Everywhere, in all times, and in every manifestation, earnest

Work and Progress proclaim to the individual that he can, through taking a right view of Life, through possessing a right faith, and through maintaining a right mode of action, place his foot on the neck of his spiritual foes, one by one, and can prove in his own case that Sin has no dominion over him, and that there is no error, no wrong, and no vice of Society which cannot be vanquished by a right mastery over the Given, and by bringing individuals to see themselves as they are, and as they might be.

Sin, then, is spiritual; but it is not of the Ultimate Reality. While the Spirit maintains an attitude of opposition to its true Ends, Sin is Real; when it returns to its right allegiance, Sin vanishes. Sin is, however, a real experience of a Real Spirit, and, as such, enters into the warp and woof of the texture of its character, and colours its whole after development. Hence is it that no imaginary push, no mere external influence, but a real spiritual effort, can overcome it. The habits which a man forms in years of vice, become, in his years of reformation, possibilities of fall which no dreaming can give him victory over. The real foes to Progress are the Spiritual ones: Self-interest, Love of Ease, Pride, and Hypocrisy. So-called natural environment may cabin and confine the Spirit, but it cannot cause the weariness, the loneliness, the heart-pain, and the calumnious misrepresentation which the Spirit of man in opposition can inflict. It is not even apprehended as a bondage till there is a de-

velopment of the Spirit; nor can it ever despiritualise and degrade of itself. It is no natural environment which sells the birthright of freedom and the right to spiritual beauty and dignity of character which are the heritage of man, but his own lust and the thoughtlessness, selfishness, and cruelty of his fellows. How to face these and vanquish them, is the problem in every age for every worker who has seen aright into the true meaning and purpose of Life.

The Ultimate Reality. We have already shown that the presence of the Absolute Ideals in man, and the very fact of his spiritual existence, imply an Ultimate Reality, who is Spirit. We have only to take our test and push back our inquiry to an ultimate position by asking the question: What must the Ground of All be conceived to be; or, what do the Absolute Ideals imply, in order to see that only an Absolute and Infinite Spirit will satisfy all the conditions and demands? It would be contradictory to assert that the Spirit of man can have its source or sustaining power in aught else than Spirit. The government of the Absolute Ideals in the individual and the race points to but one conclusion. The nature of Truth and Morality, as of Error and Sin; the teaching of Work and Progress; the presence of the Absolute Ideals in the Spirit; the existence of Spirits who manifest themselves through the Given, yet work out their Lives in a spiritual domain where alone they can have communion; and the demands which the

Ultimate Reality must satisfy,—all bespeak, and point to, a Spirit absolute, infinite, eternal, and perfect in goodness, love, justice, beauty, and truth. He it is whose law we read in earth and sky, the revelation of whose attributes is given in those Absolute Ideals which make Progress and Truth possible for man, and who so encircles our being, and calls for our obedience at every step, that we can truly say: In Him we live, and move, and have our being.

CHAPTER III.

THE GIVEN. EXPERIENCE. FACT. TRUTH. REASON.

SEC. I. THE GIVEN. EXPERIENCE AND FACT.

(A). *The Given: Introduction.* We have now reached a position from which the All assumes the coherence of a system; order arises to us out of what was once so chaotic; and we can separate the different existences or beings which depend for what they are on the One Ultimate Reality, encircling and working through them all. If we regard the All with reference to the Ultimate Reality, we must separate it into the Real and the Non-Real. Under the Real we must place the Absolute Spirit, and the Spirits of men in so far as they obey the Absolute Ideals, which are but manifestations of the Divine Attributes, shining into them to guide them upwards to perfection; and under the Non-Real we must place (1) the Spirits of men in opposition to the Real, (2) The Given: that which is necessary for the manifestation of the Real in Space and Time, (3) The Unreal (as of our dreams). If we leave

the Absolute Spirit out of our survey, we can group the All, so viewed, into three Existences: (1) Spirits in conformity with the Absolute Spirit, (2) Spirits in opposition to Him, (3) The Given in Space and Time, through which the Spirits are enabled both to reveal their conformity with, and opposition to, Him. But while these divisions are necessary for our discussion, we must guard against making them rigid or clean-cut. We must remember that, while both good and bad Spirits alike act of their own free wills, their every act has reference to the Absolute Spirit, and the powers or modes of activity they use to express His will, or to contest it, are His gifts to them; and also we must remember that the Given is by His fiat, and for His ends; and that it, too, reveals His Glory to the eye which indeed can see. Let us now turn and look at that form of existence which we have throughout called the Given; and that we may the better understand what we mean by it, and what are the problems involved in it, let us first note the various forms it can assume.

Forms of the Given. These we shall briefly glance at under the three heads: Nature, Self, Society.

a. Nature: The Matter and Energy which must be postulated as the substratum of that Given in whose conquest the Natural Scientist is ever unfolding the might of the Spirit.

The aspect of the whole of this Given which each particular Physical Science appropriates to itself. Thus, Chemistry deals with the elemental consti-

tuents of material bodies, and their modes of combination and resolution; Physics deals with the different forms of Energy; etc. Each has a particular view-point, a particular mode of viewing the material whole, from which it does not depart. No one Science, then, gives the rounded whole of our knowledge of the Given in Matter.

The Human Body. This, which, under different aspects, is embraced by many of the Physical Sciences, and which, under a particular aspect, is the domain of Physiology, really comes under the last heading; but from its importance, and from its peculiarly intimate connection with the Spirit of man, it merits a separate division. These classes also embrace all the accepted theories and explanations which represent man's conquest of the particular Given of facts up to the present time.

b. Self: The number and modes of working of the several Manifestations.

The number and modes of working of the several Activities. These with the Manifestations form the weapons which the Spirit must master.

Original and spontaneous movements of the Spirit's energies, usually termed impulses or instincts, which form the basis, source, and sustaining power of the Activities and Manifestations. These, too, have to be directed into, and kept, in the right channels of their usefulness.

The formed Character at any time viewed as apart from the creating Spirit, or that Character so far as it has been formed in opposition to the

Absolute. These have to be used or mastered by the Spirit, in order that its true ends may be realised.

The Temptations, which assail the Spirit in its every act, to take the Given for Reality, to take the Activities, Manifestations, and Formed Character for its own Reality, and to use all these for ends opposed to the Absolute Ideals. In other words, the Spirit is tempted to make an ideal of its own creation, or to worship itself. This attempted withdrawal of its own energies from their rightful aims, and the clustering of them round itself, form what is known as the SELF. There can be but one of two Gods for Human Worship, but one of two supreme ends for his action: The Absolute or The Self.

The opposition to Progress of Spirits in Error, or under the Sins of Ignorance, Laziness, or Positive Wickedness. This has been already dealt with in the last section. Viewed, however, from the standpoint of Progress, it is a Given which must be vanquished.

The Given that Work presents in every situation which has to be mastered.

c. *Society:* Its Institutions, Laws, Customs, Language, Literature, Religions, Beliefs, and Ceremonies, etc.: all viewed as ends in themselves, as absolute in themselves, and apart from the Human Spirits who created them, the Ideals which guided their formation, and the Spirits who now apprehend and use them. These together might be called Authority; but Authority, as I understand it, in-

cludes the apprehension of both spirit and form, and not of the latter alone.

The subtle links which, through the possession of a common nature—common Ideals and common modes of viewing and realising them—bind man to man, and generation to generation. In dealing with Sin as opposed to the Ultimate Reality, we mentioned, as such a link, the Trust with which the young receive the teaching of the old, and men take each other's word.

Having taken this survey, we are now prepared for a definition of the Given: The Given is that which the Spirit of man is called on to master through Work, in order that he may reveal his own true nature, and the nature of Ultimate Reality.

Objections to this Classification. It may be urged against this scheme of classification by those who would not deny the existence of the Given, that its divisions are logical, not real, and that the acceptance of them is at variance with the Unity of Life, the position which this Thesis so stoutly maintains. Answering *generally,* we can maintain that the divisions are as real as are those between the Activities—Memory, Reasoning, Loving, Resolving,—or those between the Natural Sciences; and that the Unity of Life is never endangered by the recognition of distinctions which the understanding of Life necessarily imposes. Life cannot be understood apart from such distinctions as the Absolute and the Relative, the Real and the Non-

Real, the Spirit and the Given, The Given mastered and the Given triumphant.

My whole contention respecting Error and Sin must fall to the ground, if man have it not in his power to use for his degradation the means given him for his development. Now these means I call the Given, and all I am contending for is: That man is tempted to take the form for the Spirit, the weapon for the warrior, the realised institution for the complete embodiment of the Truth, the Given for Reality; and yielding to this, is so blinded that he is unable to see the Spirit anywhere. If this temptation be not a real experience to man, then I have woefully misinterpreted the teachings of History, and the struggles of the individual for a better Life. *To come more into detail*, it can surely be urged as a tenable position that the classes given under *Nature* involve distinct and real temptations, which beset those occupied in the Natural Sciences. The temptation to take Matter for the All is surely no fanciful sketch of Life, or what shall we say of Materialism? Is there not the temptation which the Mathematician may fall into, of regarding his Truth as the only Truth, and his sphere as the only sure basis of Reality; or am I mistaken in thinking that Physicists have sometimes been tempted to believe that Biologists are not so careful in their investigations, nor so rigorous in the application of their tests, as they themselves are? And surely the history of every line of investigation, as of every department of Life, can furnish examples of thinkers

and investigators, who, having given a solution of certain problems, obstinately regard this as the final truth on these, and bitterly oppose the views of other workers in the same field. It may be contended with truth that these temptations are in nowise confined to the investigators of Nature, but are to be met with wherever man is at work. In the final issue, indeed, all Work possesses the same character, all Temptation is one in essence, and Truth cannot be separated from Goodness; but, ere we penetrate to this ultimate view, let us look at the Work of Life in the broad general aspects, and in the particular forms of the Given, and of Temptation it presents to the children of men. We shall best answer questions as to the existence and nature of the Given, when we find out under what forms, if any, it presents itself in the Work of Life. Were I asked to enumerate the various forms of Temptation, I should run over all the forms of the Given, and then point out that it is one or other of these idols which man is being asked from moment to moment, by the subtle voice of temptation, to fall down and worship. The Philosopher, like every other man, must take the facts of Life, and the divisions which the Work of man has enabled him to make, and must then penetrate to their inner meaning and real significance. But now if temptation be a real experience, and if every temptation, itself purely spiritual, be associated with a form of the Given which it suggests is Reality, what are we to say of this Given—is it spiritual

or non-spiritual; is it of, or something other than, the Spirit?

The *Existence of the Given.* I raise the issue differently from the old schools of Realism and Idealism. Believing that man is a thinker only in so far as he is a doer, that man's Reason is immanent in all his acts, that Reason is to be understood only in association with Ends, and that, in order to know what is or what we can know, we must institute an immanent criticism of Life as it is, I simply come to Life and ask the question: What does Life say as to the existence of the Given?

In brief, the answer which Life returns to our inquiry is the emphatic deliverance: There must be a Given other than the Spirit, if Life is to be possible. Life cannot be understood apart from three things: a Spirit in man, called on to develop itself through Work, and to realise an infinite perfection through an infinite Progress; an Absolute Spirit, revealing Himself through Absolute Ideals to guide man in this Progress; and a Given, through the conquest of which man's Spirit develops itself, finds its strength and its weakness, and learns to know itself, and the Ultimate Reality on which it depends. If it be retorted here: Such a Given is only a postulate; it has existence only in the mind of man; Idealism still holds the fort—we have to ask our opponents to define the term *postulate.* If they understand by it an abstract logical demand, we can answer that we are not here dealing with Epistemology, but with the facts of Life. If the

Given be a postulate of our thought, then so is the Spirit of man, and so is the Ultimate Reality; if it be a logical abstraction, so are they; and if they are necessary to Life as it is, so is it. When we can prove that, without a Given, Life would be unintelligible and impossible, we have set the existence of the Given on the most stable foundation man knows of.

After the numerous references in the course of our inquiry to the particular point under examination, it is not now necessary to do more than merely recapitulate the utterances of Life everywhere as to the existence of a Given. We have found man's mission to be Work, and we have found that Work ever to involve the transformation of a Given. The problems of every situation, of every act of this Work, make no uncertain sound here. The general in the battlefield, the mother in the home, the Scientist in his research, the inventor in his attempts and trials,—all alike are endeavouring to shape a Given into the realisation of a desired end. Every manifestation echoes the cry of Work with vigour, Religion being loudest with its sad wail: O, wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from the body of this death? The great facts of Life: Sorrow, Loss, Death, Difficulty, Failure, Triumph, Remorse, Repentance, Hope,—all shout through Pessimism or Optimism, or whatever be the form of utterance: There is a Given, which is not the All; a Given which is not the be-all and the end-all of Life. If Progress be only possible

through the transformation of an Is into a reflection of an Ought, manifestly there must be both an Is and an Ought. Viewing Life in its final terms, we find that Thought, as Work, would be impossible without such terms, and what they stand for, as: Relative, Temporary, Non-Real, Phenomenon, Revelation, Appearance, Existing. Do these not stand for a Given which is not the Real, for the means of the manifestation of Something which itself is not caught in these meshes of Space and Time; or if not, what do they represent? The theories of Materialism, and of all forms of Naturalism, and the mode of Life known as Pharisaism, prove there is something other than Spirit, which the Spirit can be persuaded to identify itself with, and to regard as the only Real man can know. It needs not to call in the testimony of Temptation and Sin to this fundamental separation in Life. The Given then is, is necessary to the manifestation of Ultimate Reality, and to the development of the Human Spirit in Space and Time; but it is not the All, it is not Reality; nor is to be identified with that Spirit; for were it so, Work and Progress would be at an end, man would lie sunk in a sleep deeper than the Mongolian conservatism brings, and Life would not be Life.

How the Given is known. When the question: How is the Given known, is asked; we can reply by asking: How is Ultimate Reality known? How does the Spirit know itself? There is but one answer to all alike: Through Work, through Pro-

gress, through Development, through Subjection of the Given to the Absolute Demands of Ultimate Reality. The distinction between the Given and the Real is made clear to man through failure and through success, through defeat and through victory. What Significance could Opposition have, if there were not something to be overcome; what terror could Difficulty have, if there were not something barring the path of Progress? What empty terms Sorrow and Loss become, if there be not a ghastly Given, terrorising the Spirit by its hideous semblance to Reality. If the Spirit is to attain Reality, and reach the Stature of its own manhood, these foes must all be met and vanquished. No mere thinking will do this, no abstract thought apart from Life as it is. The cobra of Indian jungles, the shark of tropical seas, the famine of India, the drought of Australia, the blizzard of America, the bubonic plague of the East, the cancer, consumption, and insanity of our own lands,—these are concrete representatives of a Given which must be vanquished by man, or he must sink in helplessness before them. He must grapple with these, and worse forms than these; he must often go down in the struggle, but with renewed courage must he rise to the fight, and persevere through test and experiment, through failure and success, till the Given is his Slave or lies crushed beneath his feet. In this struggle each man does not toil alone; his fellows are with him in the fight; they share with him the same hopes and fears; they look forward with him to

the day of ultimate triumph; their labours, wins, and defeats become a part of his own experience, and hasten and perfect his achievements, and they stand by his side in the day of his triumph, making yet gladder by their sympathy the joy of his heart. The great man but stands on the shoulders of his fellows, his eye pierces yet farther the horizon of their ken, but their eyes are wistfully following the path of his own. Were there not eager waiting souls ready to appreciate the message from his lips, or the deed or instrument of his handiwork, he would pass among his fellows like a lost soul in a lonely world, unheard, unknown, and alone. Thus the solidarity of the race in aim and work is maintained; and the fruits of the victory are for all. But neither fight nor victory is to be represented as a thought or as an idea, though it can be represented in thought and by ideas. The truth that Idealism stands for is: Man cannot know anything till he has mastered it by his Spirit. It, however, interprets the mastery as an intellectual process only, and considers intellectual knowing as the victory itself. Realism stands for the truth, that there is more in Life's struggles than an intellectual problem, and that the opposition to be overcome is not to be solved as any feat of abstract reasoning. We stand both for the mastery by the Spirit which Idealism has during the ages fought for, and also for the reality of the effort which the Spirit must exert, and the presence of a Given to be mastered, both of which are the contentions of

Realism; we stand for the inseparableness of Thought and Work, and for the Unity of the Spirit in that conquest which is at once its development and the revelation of its Reality. Did man know nothing but ideas, Life would not be the stern, grim fight against pitiless foes which it is. It is in Work we find its true interpretation and signification, and this Work has Thought immanent in the whole process; or rather, the Spirit at work is conscious of its whole experience, and of itself in that experience, and this consciousness is Thought. But the Thought as reflecting the whole experience, must represent not itself, but what is experienced, and the nature of the experience. Life, then, is wider than Consciousness, and is as embracing as is the Work of the Spirit; for it includes all that is in the Spirit, or implied in its Work, whether it break forth into consciousness or not, or whether it is spiritual or non-spiritual, real or non-real. It includes the Ultimate Reality in so far as the Spirit has apprehended it, or is obedient or disobedient to its absolute demands, and it includes the Non-Spiritual or Given in so far as the Spirit has given to it a formation, and made it subservient to its ends. If the objection be urged: Man, as a finite Spirit, cannot know the Infinite nor the Absolute, nor can Spirit know aught but Spirit, we have simply to point out that the question is begged in the meanings given to *finite Spirit* and *know*, and that, as a matter of fact, man does know the Infinite and the Absolute, and, through his mastery over it, does know a Given

which is non-spiritual, and non-real. In the very experience by which he knows the Absolute Spirit or his fellows, he distinguishes between the Non-Spiritual and the Spiritual, the Non-Real and the Real, the Phenomenon and the Nonmenon, that which is different from, or opposed to, his true ends, and that which is like, or in agreement with, them; and in that experience he is aware there is implied more than he now knows, but some of which he will yet know, and he is also aware that he may never fully know all the implications in their entirety.

The Ultimate Nature of the Given. When we come to this question, thought fails us, because the Spirit fails us. The Spirit is unable to speak of that which it has in no way apprehended or comprehended; and this is its position with reference to the Ultimate Nature of anything. To know the Ultimate Nature of the Given, man would need to know the Ultimate Nature of himself, and of Ultimate Reality, and be able to answer all the perplexing questions which gather round the ultimate *Whys*. Man must take himself, his work, his fellows, and history as he finds them; he must endeavour to understand all they in truth are, so that he may know how to direct his course, and accomplish that he has been sent to do. In the Work of Life he finds abundant opportunities of testing his conclusions and perfecting his wisdom; but the ultimate Why of anything remains still unsolved. The ultimate nature of the Given is

no more a mystery than is the question: Why have I got just the number of activities and manifestations I have; or: Why has God made man so that it is possible for him to sin; or: Why has God made man to suffer pain and sorrow? These are indeed all bound together, and could we answer one, we could answer all; but till we can know God as He is, and can fathom His infinite purpose, they must remain unanswered by us. Meantime, enough light is cast upon them all to enable us to do our Work, and to inspire us with the hope that, one day, we may grasp them in something like their entirety. Wisdom points out to us that further knowledge for the present is impossible to us, and would be incomprehensible to us. I cannot know, then, how the Spirit is linked to the Given or enabled to master it, nor how Spirit is linked to Spirit, and all to the Infinite Reality; and yet I can know they are linked. I can distinguish between the Real and the Non-Real, Truth and Falsehood, Holiness and Sin; I know myself as Spirit, and can know that the Ultimate Reality is Spirit also; and I know there is a Given which I have mastered, and have yet further to master, and that this Given, when mastered, exhibits itself as a revelation of the Absolute Spirit whose Ideals guided its conquests; but what the Given is in itself, I cannot say.

A Final Word. We contend here that we have in this inquiry pursued the immanent criticism we set before ourselves, and have not begged the question by bringing to it any one-sided view of

Life. We have not pretended that we have a foot-rule with which we can measure the Absolute, the Infinite, and the Perfect, as some schools of Idealism have done; nor have we tried to fathom the depths of Life's possibilities with the plummet-line of our little theory.

Taking Life as it is, we have found it necessary to allow for the play within it of both the Relative and the Absolute, the Finite and the Infinite, the Imperfect and the Perfect; and we have endeavoured to be true to Progress, and so, to represent the present stage of man's advance as not the final one. Nor have we begged the question by pretending to solve all mysteries, and by blinking our eyes to the mysteries which surround our every step, our every act.

All forms of the Given are necessary for its development in Space and Time, save Conscious Opposition to the Absolute, Positive Wickedness. Matter there must be. To man at first it must have been a chaos; and yet, in thinking of primeval man, we must be careful not to think of him as knowing of the vast Unknown around him, or as dreading what he did not know. He was rather as a child, limited in his knowledge, happy in his ignorance, and content with his Life, which he was ever endeavouring to widen. Out of the chaos of things which at first lay around him, guided by faith in his Ideals, he has through toil and struggle won the view of the Cosmos, which is in the possession of the Natural Sciences, and, all along, he has

had proofs that he is on the way to eternal Truth, and that Nature, rightly viewed, but reflects the glory he sees within himself. If Matter, rightly understood, be indeed a manifestation of God, and man be called on to develop himself through the search for, and the correct interpretation of, the revelation, which, by reason of what is revealed, must be spelled out in the stages of an infinite Progress, then indeed must every generation rest content with knowing but a part of Eternal Truth; for, till man has exhausted the infinite nature of God, he cannot exhaust the infinite revelation of Matter. Man's Spirit, in which is the Infinite, will struggle after an infinite perfection in all its manifestations, and the Given responds to his call to minister to his development and growing needs. Thus is the Given necessary to man, and necessary as an infinite possibility of opposition, discovery, help, and progress. But not the Given of Conscious Sin, of Positive Wickedness. Error and unwitting wrong we must expect from the nature of man, and the nature of his Work; and these bring to man punishment equally with the misdeed intentionally wrought; for so must it be, that man may learn the Truth, and may make Progress; but no justification can be given for the sin man works against light and knowledge. That such sin is, is too sad, too universal a fact, for any man to hide it away. The Spirit can place itself in opposition to Divine leadings and Divine Love: this is a solemn, sober fact of Life. It is because of its very

nature, in that it represents an attitude of the Spirit so destructive to its vital interests, that I placed Sin in a different category from the rest of the Given. The Given is ever the Is, or the Form apart from the Spirit, or Matter viewed as apart from all spiritual mastery or revelation; but Sin is an attitude of the Spirit itself, it is the Spirit acting in a false, ruinous way. Hence its awful, its hideous, its portentous Reality.

(B). *Experience.* Life now presents itself to us as a Work in which a Real Spirit is moulding a Given to its ends, these ends being either in agreement or in disagreement with the nature of Ultimate Reality. The result of this Work, when directed to the right ends, is the attainment by the Spirit of a Character which ever more and more reflects the nature of Reality, while the Character formed by opposition to the right ends will reflect a denial of, and opposition to, Reality itself. This Work presents itself under another aspect as Experience, and we now stay a moment to notice the signification which should be attached to this oft much-abused term. It is enough for all present purposes if we notice it as used in three senses: (1) as Sense or Empirical Experience, (2) as equivalent to Knowledge, (3) as the changes in the growth or decay of the Spirit effected by its own activities. The first use is usually attributed to the ordinary man and to the naturalistic philosopher. But I do not think that the ordinary man uses the term with the same arbitrary abstractness as does his more learned

brother; he has no experience which he does not impute to himself, whereas the Naturalist uses experience as if it matters not whether there be a Spirit or Self at all or not. The difference is vital. The two may agree in this, that neither consciously brings to light all that is implicated in an experience; but as the ordinary man associates all his experiences together, and never views them abstractly, but always with reference to himself, he does not fall into the pitfalls which lie in the path of all who will put abstractions for realities. The Naturalist, if I understand his procedure aright, takes experience as given through the Senses, but as destitute of all spiritual reference; and then seeks to show that such experience can furnish no basis to a spiritualistic view of Life. He certainly is right in his conclusion, but we shall presently examine Experience, and see if there be such an existence, or entity, or thing as the Sense-Experience of the Naturalist. The second use of the term need not stop us from proceeding to the third and rightful use of the term. If it be used to preclude a knower, it is vicious, and must be condemned with the first use; if it be used to imply a knower, and all else Knowledge implies, it is really contained in the third use. This makes it as broad as Life itself, and wider than Consciousness in the ordinary sense of that term. It embraces in its wide sweep man's thinking, feeling, willing, hoping, striving, failing, and accomplishing. It leaves out nothing that happens to man, none of his interests, and none of his aims. It includes

his Work in the widest sense of that term, under every form in which it is carried on, and with every state of mind which accomplishes it; and so will yield the same analysis of ultimate existences as does Life itself. I think the more the term is examined, the more clearly is it seen that any narrower scope than this for Experience is arbitrary and misleading.

To support this view, let us *first* notice the individualistic character of Experience. This is sometimes forgotten even by Philosophers, and we hear of an Experience which is no person's, but which has arisen self-evolved and perfect out of individual experiences, and which, thus being no man's child and under no authority, is full of wilfulness and caprice, and capable of doing much mischief to those who put their trust in her. The truth is, that philosophers, like other men, mistake abstractions for realities, and, by continually losing sight of the implications of a term, come to use it as if it had no such implications. Now, at bottom, all Experience is individualisitic; man, if he will keep in the region of facts, cannot transcend his own attainments, so that the farthest reach of Experience is still some man's own achievement. If I have not learned, I cannot value, understand, or even talk of, the results of learning; if I have not been tempted, I cannot understand temptations or the struggles of a man wrestling with a bad habit or an evil suggestion; if I have not worked, Work is a mystery to me; and so if I have not acquired an Experience

of my own, I cannot understand the Experience of anyone. Happily, Work bears similar characters everywhere, and the experience of it in any department enables one to appreciate it, at least in some degree, in other spheres; but this can be said, that, if a man has never passed through a particular experience, or kind of experience, that remains for him an unopened book, an unentered garden shut off from him by a blank wall. Thus, for the man who has not been called on to make a moral choice, to make a sacrifice, to encounter a difficulty, or to go through the sorrow for the death of a dear one, the experience is meaningless, or is robbed of rightful significance. We can see this in the attempts of the scientist or writer who has not passed through the experiences of a religious history, to give an adequate account of Religion. He deals only with externals; the real core of the matter, through want of experience, he rejects or overlooks. We can see it, too, in the material evolutionist who writes on Morals. His description of the outside of the edifice may be masterly and complete, but if he fail to penetrate to the unseen builder within whose construction it all is, the method, reason, and purpose of the whole will be wanting in his account. So we can lay down that if an "Experience" has not been, and is not, the result of someone's labours, it is to be rejected and driven forth as a daw with borrowed feathers. Further, that no man is competent to write on that which is the product of Experience, unless he has passed through

such an experience himself. The sceptic cannot teach Religion. "Where Ignorance is, there should be neither affirmation nor denial."

But this is not to say that Experience is merely individual or subjective. It does not imply that there are no universal elements in Experience. In every manifestation there are universal demands, which its science seeks to unfold. These, when stated, are abstract; they give little help to their concrete embodiment; yet they are in the Spirit to be complied with, and to receive form, content, and colour from each man through his ever-enlarging experience. Now if we speak of Experience in the general sense, meaning those elements of it which are common to all individual experiences, we must take care, and not deal with it as if it were a concrete Reality. It is viewed apart from the individuals; it is an abstraction, a Given; and can never take the place of the Actual Experience, which is the very life-blood and tissue of a human Spirit in its realisation of itself as a Character.

In the *second* place, let us note the spiritual reference of Experience. Every Experience implies a Spirit at work in it, moulded by it, and possessing it. The common elements of Experience can have no recognition from me, if I do not see them in my own experience. There can be no talk of Experience if Life be merely the performance of an automaton, or if man be determined by outer forces to go through Life as if it were a game of blind-man's-buff, and he the ever-blinded player. The

real experiences are those in which a Spirit is called on to wrestle for its very existence, to maintain its straight path against an alluring temptation, to perform some arduous labour, to face some great sorrow, or to achieve a victory. These are indeed the trials of Life, the touchstones of Character, the winnowing fans which separate the chaff from the real grain, the epochs and crises of a human existence. An Experience, to be real, must enter into the tissues of the forming Character; it must be such that it colours all after-existence, and helps to determine all after-formation. Rightly understood, a Spirit cannot be separated from its Experience, any more than from its activities, manifestations, and forming Character; if such separation be made, we have an abstraction, a Given. Hence we see the importance of the moral element in Experience; if this be lost sight of, it is indeed not Experience we have, but its shadow. It is because of the spiritual nature of Experience, that the experiences of our fellows are so easily understood by us; it is through our own Experience that we so speedily learn to distinguish between the living and the lifeless, the human and the brute, the real and the non-real, the manifestations and the Spirit manifested, the acts and the actor; and that we come to see that the real and abiding things are Truth, Goodness, Love, and Beauty, and that the Spirit not manifesting these in daily life is indeed wandering from its true ends.

It is not then the Spiritual, but the Empiricist who has to fear the appeal to Experience. This

was indeed Mill's conclusion when he allowed that, in the final issue, Materialism has no weapons against Idealism. The issues are constantly changing between the supporters of naturalistic and of spiritualistic views of Life; but, in whatever form the issue is presented, the spiritualists need not hesitate to accept the challenge. All that has to be agreed on at the outset is, that neither side must lay down an arbitrary or artificial definition of Experience. The appeal then will not be to any form of Experience, but to all forms; and the question to be asked is: What does this imply to make it possible? No man who makes the appeal to Experience, can ignore the understanding of moral and religious phenomena, and these point to but one conclusion. Even if the appeal be made to isolated acts of Experience, or to that form of it which is supposed to be the special property of the Natural Scientist, the Naturalist cannot triumph. For here we have something grasped and apprehended. By what? we ask. By mind! We have something agreed upon. Agreed by whom? By minds. We have something considered necessary. And the consideration of this leads us to see that such NECESSITY can exist only for minds which can distinguish between necessary and relative. Were there not minds which acknowledge that this particular mode of regarding the facts ought to be taken as the true mode, then no such necessity could exist; and men would indeed be as wavering in their beliefs, as the restless waves are to any fixed place;

and as difficult to hold down to any one assertion, as it is to keep the storm-clouds at rest.

In the *third* place, let us note the relation of Experience to the Given. Experience embraces the Given as Life embraces it; its embrace of it is simply the mastery of the Spirit over it. A Given has been indeed mastered if the Spirit be confident that the Given is its slave, and that it is now able to go forth to further conquests. Even if the particular Given have slipped from his bonds, the strength gained in the mastering of it remains, and demonstrates its existence in the Work of every-day. I may have forgotten much of the Mathematics and Classics I learned at school, but the mental discipline, the concentration of effort, the ability to seize the main point of a problem, the maturity of judgment, the sympathy with past ages and with other forms of our own ideals,—these have not passed, and cannot pass away. They are inalienably mine; no man gave them to me, and no man can take them away. If on the other hand, along with this development of Character, I keep my hold on the subjects, I am enabled thereby to solve my problems in Astronomy, Surveying, Gunnery, to enter into the thoughts and life of the classical, and of mediæval times, and so can make Life deeper, richer, and fuller through my ability to use these possessions—these forms of the Given. Knowledge is power; but such Knowledge is thorough mastery over some Given, the power gained by such mastery, the skill which is its signs. The Spirit delineates the steps it has

taken in such mastering, its methods of handling the Given, and throws its conquest into the form of a theory, a law, a social institution, so that others may be enabled to enter into the fruits of the conquest, into the same expansion and enrichment of Life which it itself has gained. The real thing for it, however, is not such theory or institution, but that development of the Life which these signify and secure. What does any achievement of man's signify to him who has not gone through the experience which can enable him to appreciate it? What is the value of a watch or a maxim gun to the African pygmies? What would a South Sea Islander understand of England's might and resources from a visit to the astronomical observatory, Woolwich arsenals, Portsmouth's fleet, Birmingham's manufactories, Parliament Buildings, or St. Paul's? They would be *things* to him, vast unknown signs of something too great for him, conveying no information as to the strength, resourcefulness, wealth, wisdom, and justice of the English people. The Given, then, in any form is not the Real; in all the forms in which man has clothed it, it represents a victorious experience; he who has not that Experience, cannot interpret it. That Experience is truly Real, and reveals the abiding source of all Reality.

(C). *Fact.* Here, too, we have a term much abused. At times it is used of the mere Given, as bereft of all spiritual reference; whereas its very use signifies that it has reference to the Spirit using it. There can be no Fact apart from Experience,

and as there can be no Experience apart from a Spirit, so there can be no Fact which is wholly non-spiritual. A Fact is an item of Experience; it is any part, doing, or happening in the great whole of Life. When we understand that the Given is known by man only so far as he has mastered it, that his mastering of it implies both his development and its subjection, it will be seen that there is no such thing as a brute fact, standing out of all relation to the Spirit of man. In putting a name upon it, in calling it a fact, man is expressing a certain conquest over it, and is bringing it into relation to all his Knowledge and all his Experience. The more names he puts upon it, the more affirmations he makes of it, the greater is his conquest, and the more is his power established over it. I do not create the facts as they are in themselves, I have no voice in calling them into being, but I do help to create the Experience which makes them what they are to me. I cannot see in children's games, superstitions, and old customs what the anthropologist can see; nor, if I am destitute of religious experience, can I fully understand the Vedic hymns, the Egyptian Book of the Dead, the rites and ceremonies of Christian worship, or the place of Religion in the Life. Hence it is, that the eye sees only what it is capable of seeing, and that every fresh advance transforms every fact embraced. Hence is it, too, that new facts are only perceptible to him who has the power to see them. Edison, we say, stumbled accidentally

on the phonograph ; but if his Spirit had not attained that development which gave the new fact a deeper meaning than its surface bore, the phonograph had not then been born. The operator at the wires, seeing the same facts, saw not their deeper signification, nor the lamp it gave to summon a more powerful Genie than Aladdin's to obey the behests of man.

Every fact, then, has reference to an Experience —mine or that of another. It is what it is in the light of that whole experience. As man cannot jump out of himself, so he cannot make a fact other than his experience interprets it. So-called facts of the Given, as much as the facts of the most exalted Mysticism, are alike conditioned in this way. Even the basal facts of human existence, the fundamental existences on which Life depends—God, the Spirit, and the Given—must submit to the conditions of the Experience. I know God, myself, and the Given, only so far as I know them ; they cannot be more to me than my Experience allows them to be. They are known to me in my Experience ; yet though they are thus brought together in every act, I know that God is not my Spirit, nor the Given, nor is my Spirit either or both. I cannot, therefore, penetrate facts any deeper than my Experience has insight, I can never get at any Thing-in-Itself. The only intelligible Thing-in-Itself of any fact is that fact unfolding itself as a mastery over the Given by the Spirit of man in obedience to the demands of the Absolute. If it be asked, *how* is it

possible for me to see in any single fact, as related to my whole Experience, the presence of my own Spirit, of the Divine Spirit, and of the Given, I cannot answer the *how*; I know only that so it is. But I am in no worse plight here than I am when asked to explain how my Spirit can hold all its experiences—its diverse thoughts, feelings, desires, and resolutions, its good and its bad acts, its defeats and victories—in one Unity, relating them all to itself and to one another. I cannot answer the *how*. I can only state the fact. To be able to do more in either case, I should have to know the Absolute as He is.

SEC. II. TRUTH.

What we are to understand by Truth. Throughout our discussions we have been supposing that Truth must be understood as: Correspondence with, or reflection of, Reality; the realisation by man of what Really Is; the mastery over the Given, which enables man to see in it the revelation of the Spiritual, and the minister of spiritual ends; in short, an expression through the Given of word or deed of an Absolute End. It is now fitting that we should examine this definition both in the light of the facts of Life, and the interpretation of them given by other definitions, so that we may be assured that we know what Truth is and what it implies. Life, rightly understood, is the attempt made by individual Spirits to attain complete development. Possessed of spontaneous sources of energy, and

of infinite possibilities of attainment; under the inspiration and government of infinite ideals, which whisper the possibilities that can be realised; formed so, that, while the spontaneous energies burst out, in some in one direction, in others in other, each manifestation is a revelation of the Spirit as a whole, and all but serve the end of complete self-development; and linked to one another, so that, just as no manifestation of the Spirit can thrive and flourish at the expense of the others, all are members one of another, and every one needs the help of each and all to attain to his own ends, the Spirits of the children of men lead their lives, continue the progress of the past, and form together a rounded whole of Life. No view of Life can be accepted which leaves out of sight its purposive character, or which would make it other than the attempt to realise ends and self-development. So, too, Truth for each successive generation of men can be only that apprehension and realisation of Ultimate Reality they have been able to gain, and each distinct and single truth must have this view of Ultimate Reality for a basis and background.

That men are ever seeking for something deemed Real and of inestimable worth, is either a fact, or Life has neither purpose nor meaning; that, in the search for it, they will endure hardships and make the greatest of self-sacrifices, is the plainest fact of human Progress; that, in this search, they attain a character which to them is real, and of the nature of the Reality they seek, and that the attain-

ment of their end gives them abiding satisfaction, and is to them the Truth, is either true, or the men who have sustained, and do sustain, Progress in all manifestations, neither know what they seek for nor what they say. Take the child, unconscious as yet of his powers, but learning what they are, and what is his work. In his games he shows that power of origination and creation which is the sign of Progress everywhere; and in them, too, he will often exhibit that tendency of his Spirit, that gift which is his Personality, that liking for a certain manifestation which indicates the gateway through which his Spirit will burst from its unknown stronghold to the conquest of the Given. As we noticed before, a Pascal cannot be kept from Geometry even by the stern commands and preventive measures of his father; a Giotto cannot be restrained by poverty from revealing his artistic genius.

It is useless to say to such that their particular bent is wrong. They know that it is true, that in it they will attain to Truth, or their whole nature, their very Life, is a lie. The true Life is that in which the Spirit expresses itself as a whole; in which, while pouring itself out mainly in one manifestation, it does not bow to the Given anywhere; in which all its acts are done in obedience to the Absolute; and in which, consequently, there is no disunion and no discord. There is no Truth apart from an Absolute Ideal; the Spirit does not create Truth; nor does it conventionally agree to think

and act in a particular way, and call this Truth. Truth is of the ultimate nature of things; it is the endeavour by man to attain, and be, a nature in agreement with the Ultimate Nature; it is the satisfaction which comes when a man knows he has grasped the Real, that his nature is not a lie, and that Life is worth living. Whatever may be the truth, whether expressed in word or deed, when it is seen in the right light, it will be found to have the Absolute for its standing-ground and its defence. Every true judgment has for its major premise the interpretation of Ultimate Reality. Let us bring out this position more clearly by examining opposing views.

Truth is concerned only with judgments. Judgments in this view are supposed to form a close circle, and Truth remains for ever caught within it; but when we seek the answer to the question: With what are Judgments concerned, the vain pretence of the charmed ring is exposed, and we see that in Life there neither are nor can be autonomous centres and close rings, independent of all else. Life, we have to remember, is the expression of a living, working Spirit which unifies all its varied activities in itself. Whatever be the activity, be it of Thought or Action, it is in vital connection with all other experiences of that Spirit; it is but a part of the organic process of Life. An examination of Judgment establishes this beyond question. The Judgment does not arise of itself, or out of nothing; it is an act of the Reason immanent in

the whole work of Life; it is but the thought-reflection of this Work; or it is but a vital, organic part of the whole. Understanding the purposive character of Life, we can see that no act is isolated and self-subsistent, but that all acts serve final ends. Man, as we shall see later, is called on to criticise his own apprehension of his ends by that of others, and by the Work done for their realisation, and so, ever to keep a perfect balance between what he thinks is right and what in practice is found right. This work of conscious apprehension, remembering, sympathy, and criticism, thrown into words, is called Judgment. The man who asserts that Truth has to do, not with Life, but with the Judgment, can mean only, either that the Judgment and the act of the Spirit in it are to be viewed out of all connection with the rest of Life, or that the Judgment has nothing to do with the ends of Life, but aims simply at a correct interpretation of facts. The first position is manifestly untenable, for no man will hold that Truth is a mere affair of words; pushed to a corner, he must confess that what he means is, that Truth is the correspondence of Words with facts, or of a judgment with what it represents.

Truth is the correct interpretation of facts. Ere a theory, such as this, can be discussed, an agreement must be come to as to the meaning of the terms used in its statement. We take it that some upholders of this theory vaguely suppose that the interpretation of facts is an easy matter, and that there is little trouble in arriving at a correct

interpretation. There are many propositions of which this is quite true: they merely reflect common opinions about the weather, the facts of Nature, or the facts of Life; they state that such a thing is, or was, or will be; but they do not penetrate to subtle relations and wider views. Of many of our judgments, however, we state a falsehood, if we make them other than the result of toil and severest thought. Facts are not easily interpreted, as the problems of the scientist, the general, the teacher, the social reformer, and the mother will proclaim; they yield their interpretation only to him who proves himself master over them. The truth respecting the relation of all bodies in the material universe which Newton embodied in the Law of Gravitation, did not rise to his mind by a mere looking at the facts; even at the present day how many people fail to see in the motions of the moon, the movements of the tides, or the fall of an apple, what Newton enabled us to see. If Truth be a something with which all judgments are concerned, then we must recognise that, even on this theory, its attainment is often difficult.

But what are we to understand by *facts*? According to the view we have established, nothing is a fact which is out of relation to our own or some other person's experience. A fact is what it is, in so far as it has been mastered; a deeper insight into its relations is possible only to a developed and disciplined Spirit, which perceives such relations to be both possible and necessary, while

not at first able to state what the relations are. Every fact, too, has many relations, and can be viewed in many ways. Our judgment, then, respecting a fact varies with our point of view, or rather, with the end we have in our mind when we view the fact and pass judgment. If this be so, the truth of a judgment can be known only through knowing the end which gives to it its particular shape; and to acknowledge this, is to pass beyond the theory we are now considering. But the theory may take fact to mean a part of the Given, or something received out of all relation to the Spirit and its ends, or something received abstractly in a particular way. If the *first*, we can say that the Given, as Given, makes no distinction between Truth and Falsehood; if the *second*, we can deny that of such a thing anything can be either affirmed or denied; and if the *third*, we have to understand the particular mode of viewing, in order that we can judge of Truth or Falsehood, and this particular mode of viewing introduces the Spirit which for its own ends can so view facts.

Try as the theory may, it cannot get rid of the Spirit and its Ideals. If we ask it: What furnishes the test for the correctness of our interpretation, it can consistently answer only, *the facts*. Does it mean by this, the facts as viewed before the interpretation is gained, or after it has been gained? For example, did Newton get the test of the correctness of his law of Gravitation from the facts as

formerly viewed (the isolated facts: falling of the apple, ebb and flow of the tides, motions of the moon, etc.), or as viewed when he had gained it? The test cannot be given by the former view of the facts; and to say it is supplied by the latter, is to beg the question, for the facts as now viewed derive their significance from the law they are supposed to establish, or it is but the statement of their new significance. That the so-called facts can be viewed in the light of the new theory, is quite true; but this possibility of theirs takes us but a little way into the understanding of its Truth. If it be indeed true, then it is a necessary mode of interpretation; *i.e.*, if the world is to be intelligible, and if the spiritual demands for unity, simplicity, and necessity are to be realised. The ordinary mode of stating the theory would leave out the important facts of the case: a living Spirit in man, a Work of Progress in which it is engaged, and Absolute Demands which this Work must satisfy. These are the facts of facts; no fact can be a fact without them; hence, "a correct interpretation of the facts" must take them into account. A *correct* interpretation, if it mean anything, means that in this way *must* a rational being think; and this implies a Spirit free to choose between right and wrong, and able to distinguish between the necessary and the contingent. Understanding the toil through which Truth in any instance is won, seeing clearly that the Spirit in the search and discovery is not a passive reflecting mirror, not a phonographic apparatus for

passively receiving, and mechanically giving out exactly as received, we are able to know that Truth, for it, is not something foreign to itself, and that the necessity to think in a particular way cannot come from without. The Spirit in its whole procedure takes with it Absolute Ends implicated in its every act, and, by means of these, necessity is laid upon it to think and act in particular ways. Take away from the "interpretation of facts" the Spirit, and what is there to distinguish fact from fact, not to speak of Truth from Falsehood; take away from the Spirit the sense of Absolute Ends, and its free choice to obey or disobey them, and how can the distinction arise between Necessary and Contingent Truth, or between Truth and Falsehood? Let us agree that a correct theory always interprets facts, and must be accepted, but the necessity for its acceptance can be seen only when we see that it complies with all the demands of an Absolute End, and that it marks a step forward in the attainment of an Absolute Ideal, which would be the perfection of the development of the Spirit. The "correct interpretation of facts" will be found on analysis to mean: Facts are spiritually mastered and interpreted in the light of Absolute Ends. Any other interpretation of the phrase is superficial, and leaves out of account the essential facts, without which there can be no facts, no knowledge, and no Truth. It is not seeing facts as they are, but as we think they are; it is not the spiritualistic but the naturalistic interpretation of facts which

begs the question. From all that has been already said, it is unnecessary to show how inadequate is this theory, as ordinarily interpreted, to give the slightest account of Truth in Art Criticism and in the Moral Judgments.

Truth is Relative and never Absolute. If this means that the various forms which the mastery of the Given assumes in its progression towards the fuller realisation of Reality, are only temporary, we must agree; but if it mean that there is no Absolute aimed at in these embodiments, that man cannot know the Absolute, and that no absolute statement can be made, we must utterly disagree. The very statement of the theory itself is absolutely made, and is proclaimed as Absolute Truth, whatever disclaimers its supporters put forth; and every form in which it, or any such theory, can be stated, will appear as an absolute statement. It is useless to retort: "It is only absolute for man;" for we have nothing to do with an Absolute which is not for man. If we are met with the rejoinder: Man cannot know the Absolute, we must ask for a definition of the phrase. If it mean: Know the Absolute as He is known by Himself, we agree; but if it mean that man cannot have a sense or an idea of an absolutely true, absolutely good, absolutely wise, absolutely perfect, we can only say that the man who so asserts, contradicts himself. There is no truth which does not contain an Ought, a necessity, a compliance with an Absolute End, in its heart; it may be limited and temporary, but it holds a

reference to the non-limited and eternal. Man does not know the Absolute as He is, but he is progressively coming to know Him. This is the meaning of all Progress, the Hope which inspires all advance, and the Glory which lightens and brightens the laborious days of man. The basis of every single truth is the belief in Absolute Truth; all Life, all Work rest on the faith that Ultimate Reality is, and that it is attainable; the Sceptic and Agnostic contradict themselves in proclaiming otherwise; every judgment, as we have already said, has for its major premise an interpretation of Ultimate Reality.

Science. The more fully to develop our position, the better to focus remarks and views scattered through the foregoing pages, and the more securely to pave the way for what follows, let us look at the place and function of Science in Life. Science in its perfected form designates a secondary, and not a primary manifestation of the Spirit; or, more correctly, it represents the fuller development of an immanent criticism, which the Spirit does not always bring to the level of Thought-consciousness. In every manifestation reason is immanent in the whole process, and is exercising a criticism in the light of experience, and what experience implies, on the whole work; now Science is the bringing into full consciousness of this critical and reflective process. Whatever be the act the Spirit of man is engaged in—be it an act of the primitive man or of the civilised, be it a logical course of philosophic

thought or the daily work of the artisan—there the notion of an end is present, and thought, directive, critical, and reflective, is an inseparable part or aspect of the whole. Criticism of its own act is the mark and necessary duty of a free Spirit ruled by Absolute Ideals, and this criticism thrown into verbal shape is what we call Science. We sometimes speak as if Science were the discovery of the nineteenth century, and glorify ourselves at the expense of our ancestors; the truth is, they used their critical faculties as carefully as we do ours, and attained in their day to a scientific knowledge. They knew the grounds of their beliefs as well, and could state them as accurately, as most gifted thinkers of our own time. Had there been no criticism in our fathers' thought and work, had they not exercised their every faculty, or had the Spirit in them worked differently from in us, there would have been no Progress for them, and so there would have been neither language nor garnered thought for us to build with, and build on. Science has been at work since man first began to know, and to strive for, ends. It has attained an elevated position in our century, because, through the development of man's Spirit, the thought-reflection in each of the manifestations can be disengaged from the rest of the process, and can receive a form of its own, and because this century has been marked by great advance in the Natural Sciences. But how were Progress to a Spirit liable to go astray and under the necessity to prove

every inch of its way, possible without criticism? Let us not boast of ourselves, as if such criticism and such progress are the marks of our century only; they have been the marks of every century and every generation where Ideals have been striven for, and where Self has been put under foot. Science then but unfolds the criticism immanent in every manifestation; it maps out the way by which man has arrived at Truth; it reveals the Ideals striven for, under what limitations the particular work has been undertaken, what forms the Ideal has assumed, and how man has assured himself and others he has attained his Ideals.

Seeing that there is a Science for every manifestation, and that each is but the verbal form of the reflective and critical aspect of its work, it is not difficult to see that no Science gives the whole of Reality, or can represent more than some particular mastery of the Given. Man must shape his victories in material and verbal forms; in no other way can he know his own advance, criticise his procedure, or enable his successors to enter into his labours. The knowledge he acquires in his experience, assumes an ordered form; and as his experience enlarges, the form goes through a like transformation. In the disengagement of the thought-reflection and criticism of a manifestation from the Life, the course which is usually followed, is to detail the steps taken, and victories gained, without reference to the Spirit or to its final ends. The manifestation is first viewed as detached from the Life, and then the

immanent thought-criticism is viewed as a process having an existence of its own. Thus has it come to be that men engaged in the work of particular manifestations have come to regard the Sciences of these as revealing all of Reality which can be known, and yet, all the time, they are ignorant of the fact that the formal statement of these Sciences ignores all account of the living Spirit, without which nothing can be known. What is wanted in every age is a Philosophy which will relate the Sciences to their respective manifestations, all to one another, and each and all to the final ends of Life. Then every Scientist will know what are his real presuppositions, and where is his place in the work of the great whole of Life. Wanting this, the worker in a particular sphere overestimates his own work and belittles that of his neighbour. Understanding all we have said on Progress and Work, we can see that no History of Science, however valuable as a disciplinary exercise, or for helping us to understand how the work of the present has assumed its present form, can give the Science of the present. The form in which our present knowledge is cast, must be moulded by present-day thought and work. It will be seen, then, that Science is abstract only when viewed apart from the living work in its own manifestation ; viewed in its organic connection with that work, it is a vital process. Again, the work of any manifestation, including its thought-criticism, is abstract only when viewed apart from the living Spirit and its final ends. This

for particular purposes may be done, but, in the continued exercise of such a mode of viewing, the vital relation of the work to the whole Life is lost sight of, and man is apt to raise an abstraction into a Reality.

Science, then, should not be separated from Work; it is but a form of Work; it is the whole Work or Experience of Man taking a thought and verbal form. The form is won with as much labour as is any other form for the Given, and he who can clothe the discoveries of man in accurate thought and lucid phrase, has done almost as much for the advance in that particular department, as if he had made all the discoveries himself. Without the living, striving, aspiring, conquering work of the Spirit in a particular conquest of the Given, however, Science cannot be. This is sometimes forgotten, and not only by the ignorant laity. Theology is the science of Religion; but were there not a spiritual experience peculiar to Religion, and a Logic or Reason immanent in its advance, Theology could not be. Theology is but the ordered knowledge of this living experience and growth; yet we are sometimes asked to regard the formal statement of theological doctrines as the vital essence of Religion; or as sufficient to give a man the Truth of Religion. Morality is the science of Conduct; but were there no Conduct, what would Morality be the science of? In the Natural Sciences, the term "science" is used both for the actual progressive work of the manifestation, and also for the formal

statement of its results. But we should not speak too hardly of the confusion which results from the double use of the term here, for is it not an acknowledgment on the part of the Natural Scientist that Thought and Work cannot be separated in Life and in fact, but that both go hand in hand in inseparable co-operation, and mutual stimulation to Progress? There is, however, a confusion in the term, and it sometimes leads the Natural Scientist, or his followers, to think that a Science is but an ordered array of results, and can be learned by a process of reasoning, forgetful that, in his own case, a Science has vitality only in connection with the laborious researches which give it birth. The Science of Morality cannot be understood if we know nothing of conduct and its actual problems in daily life; nor can Theology be understood apart from the Religious Experience finding expression in it. Surely this is the truth to be learned from the Natural Sciences themselves, and it is emphasised by experience everywhere.

Science, then, by itself and apart from Work, cannot give Progress, or resolve our difficulties. There is a Thought which itself is Work, but there is no Work without Thought, and Thought is only valuable when it is truly developing the Spirit, and, through mastery over the problems of daily life, is enabling man to realise his supreme ends. Such Thought is truly scientific whether it be exercised by the Mother in her home, the Farmer at his plough, the Leader on the battlefield, or the Natural Scientist in his research. As Sir Michael Foster, as President of

the British Association at Dover this year (1900), said in his inaugural address: "The men of science have no peculiar virtues, no special powers. They are ordinary men, their characters are common, even commonplace. Science, as Huxley said, is organised common-sense, and men of science are common men, drilled in the ways of common-sense." It is not for any class of workers to appropriate scientific thought to themselves; wherever Life is being enlarged, the Spirit is being developed, the Given is being conquered; there, scientific thought truly is at work. Scientific thought is not an effort of abstract reasoning; to be valuable, it must enable man to feel himself strong, and, through its achievements, to believe himself able to surmount every difficulty which bars his advance. Such thought will be found in Religion, in Conduct, in Art, in Politics, in Social Reform, and in Husbandry; therefore, let us not ignore the Unity of Consciousness by allowing Natural Science, or any other manifestation, to appropriate to itself that thought which is the indispensable auxiliary of Progress everywhere. It is for the Spirit of man to declare what are its manifestations; and into whichever it enters, it carries with it that immanent thought which is the source and creator of all Science. Science, we must remember, rises out of Life and Experience, not they out of it. Hence, religious people have not to wait for a Religion till Theologians have settled all the controversies over doctrines and beliefs; we can still be moral in conduct and

pure in heart, even though moralists have not yet agreed on the right theory of morals; and we can still praise the beautiful and appreciate a work of art, even though our theory of Art has not shaped itself, or though Art Critics cannot well determine what are the supreme canons of Art. Progress everywhere is of the Life through Work, and is not a mere matter of abstract thinking.

Philosophy. Philosophy is the Science of the Sciences. It represents the last and perfected form of reflection and critical Thought. We have seen also that, if man will see the thought as it is, and the manifestation as it is, he must see the thought to be the same thought which runs through all his Life, helping to shape and mould it, and must see it as but one aspect of his Spiritual Being, in whose depths are the sources of all activities and manifestations. Thus the immanent criticism of the single manifestation is caught up into an immanent criticism which is seated at the centre of Life itself, and views all its acts and happenings as a Unity. It is this latter criticism which results in Philosophy, and is the abiding source from which all its systems have flowed. Philosophy, then, is not an invention of the schools, or the harmless pastime of day-dreamers; it is not the attempt to know the Unknowable, or to solve the Insoluble; its creator is the Spirit of man, the need for it is in every man's consciousness; the Work of man would not be complete without it. It is the copestone of that scientific thought by means of which man

is ever assuring himself of his basis, his ends, and his results. In primitive man we see it throwing all the knowledge of man into a whole; to-day we see it breaking forth in the questions of the child as to the Whys of things, in the remarks of the humblest worker as to destiny, and the relations of all parts of his Life, and in all the attempts which are being made to reconcile Science and Religion, or to get a unity to the complex Life of our times. That Philosophers cannot agree, says nothing as to the basis or source of Philosophy itself (what body of men are agreed on all points?); that they have sometimes blundered, does not diminish the value of their work, or disprove the truth at which they aim; and that they have not yet reached a system of fixed truth, a body of unchanging certainties, is only an argument which convinces one that Philosophy is but a part of Life, and so must change its forms with the Progress of man. Philosophy itself is a Work. The Spirit as a whole is in its procedure, and is endeavouring in it to attain an Absolute Ideal; and so it is easy to see that the workers in it must blunder, and fail, and miss the mark, and must at times take error for truth, and walk in darkness as other workers. Its Ideal has to be brought into concrete form, and its demands have to be learned and satisfied; not in idle passivity, not by misunderstanding the Life of the time, but by truly understanding it, can this be done. Nor can it hope for Absolute Truth in concrete embodiment any more than can

the Scientists; it certainly has to affirm that Absolute Truth can be found, and that there is an Absolute whom man should obey; but when true to itself, and to the Life whose interpreter it is, it will not dare say that the form in which it has exhibited the Absolute Truth of the time, is the form which Absolute Truth must present to the successive generations of man.

Philosophy is, then, of the Life, or it is a mere abstraction; it is seeking to solve real problems, to remove contradictions, and so to make broad the way and easy the ascent for the development of the Spirit. In it, too, man is feeling his greatness, is assured that he is more than a mere Given, and that the Ideals within him are the enduring connection between him and Ultimate Reality. Philosophy, we say, divides itself into two parts: Ontology, and Epistemology—the former concerning itself with the problems of being, the latter with the problems of knowing; but in Life no such distinction can be made; for the problems of being are also those of knowing, and there is no problem of knowing which is not connected with the knowing of something, that is, with being. Such distinctions are necessary for logical or methodological purposes; but their abstract character should never be lost sight of, and should be stated clearly at the outset, so that the abstraction may not lead either thinker or learners astray. The philosopher who gives his days to thought, whose aim it is to give unity to Life, and to make clear how strong

are the foundations on which true Life builds, has to watch and pray lest he fall into the temptation to regard his thought-interpretation of Life as the Life interpreted. Any philosophic system which will minister to the living needs of the present, must not present extracts of Plato, the answers which Kant gave to his times, or a hash of Hegelian dialectic ; but armed with the weapons these thinkers have provided, entering into full possession of the conquests they have won over the realms of thought, it must advance to a new unification of the manifestations, a fresh statement and a fuller answer of the problems of Life and Mind. So, too, no philosophic system worthy of the name will start with an arbitrary definition of Life, or of Truth, or will declare at the outset what are, and what are not, manifestations of the Spirit. It will not, with Kant, pronounce off-hand and without examination that we can know only phenomena, or draw, with him, absolute separation between Sense and Understanding, and between both and Reason, nor will it make any such rash statement as Materialism sets out with, that we are Matter, and we can know nothing else. Philosophy must take Life as it is, must take the manifestations as the Spirit frames them, must enter into each and all, must be fair to Natural Scientist, Theologian, Moralist, Statesman, Social Reformer, Inventor, and Artisan alike, must take the distinctions which run everywhere through Life, separating it into different camps ; and thus understanding all through

experience, must ask, and answer, the questions: What must be in order that all this can be? What is the Reality on which all depends? What is the Truth the whole seeks to portray? What are the presuppositions, the existences, the realities, on which it all rests?

Criteria of Truth. In dealing with needs, we spoke of their satisfaction as a test of Truth, and, in dealing with Work throughout, we have spoken of the criterion of good Work as a like satisfaction, resting on a development of the Spirit and a mastery over the Given. In dealing with Truth throughout, we have spoken of it as the revelation of Reality, whether in word or act or material form, and we have given as the final criterion of philosophic Truth: what must be in order that this can be? What alone will give full significance to this, and harmonise it with all the facts of Life? It is now our duty to unify the criteria of Truth, and show that Truth is one, and has only one meaning whatever its expression. In many parts of his experience the ordinary man rests on the satisfaction of his Ideals, and on the added strength which accompanies this, as sufficient evidence that he has got the Truth, and that he is one with Reality. It is enough for him to know that his own Life is expanding, that former difficulties no longer frighten him, or give him trouble, and that he is not only accumulating facts of knowledge, but acquiring a strength and skill which enable him to master any situation. The truth of the knowledge proves

itself in Work. Nor can there be a better test of truth than this for practical Life, where Thought and Action are not dissociated, and where there is not the opportunity for mere abstract tests. And when we see how Thought and Action are conjoined, what better proof can we have that even a theory is true, than that it works—*i.e.*, that it expresses the mode or procedure which must be taken to reach a desired end, or fulfils the purpose such a theory ought to fulfil? The argument from Consequences has been sometimes sneered at; no doubt it has been misused, but it rests on a profound truth: In the final issue Truth and Goodness cannot be separated, and that which is false to either, is false to both. Theorists have scoffed at this presupposition, and have asserted that we must hold by a theory logically established, whatever be its effects on Conduct. The plain man might be bewildered by the logic, but he has never run into the absurdity of such a belief. Thinking and action with him are not to be so separated; that which makes a man good must be, to his thinking, true, and all arguments to the contrary are mere baseless talk, mischievous, and misleading. From all we have said of the connection of Truth with Morality, we can see that the plain man, resting on the experiences of Life, is right, and that his touchstone is a test which every theory professing to deal with Life as it is, has to reckon with.

When the plain man recommends a course of action to the young, or to his friends, he does so

because he knows it will attain an end which all wish to reach. This is the presupposition which underlies his advice: it is his test put into another form. The practical exigencies of Life call for action, and here the counsel of the sage and the experienced is valuable. Here an end has to be gained, and the practical question is: What must I do, how can I master the Given, so that this end may be attained? The experienced man answers: This do, and you will attain your end. The application of the plan to action soon proves its truth or falsehood, whether it accords with the Reality of things or not. Mastery over a Given, a stronger Character, a wider view of Life,—these, the marks of the satisfaction the plain man seeks for, all rest on that view of Life we have all along been contending for. There is no mastery over a Given which is not compliance with the demands of Ultimate Reality, and no strength of Character is gained except through obedience to the same Supreme Authority; so that the plain man's test, put into philosophic language, means: Truth is obedience to the demands of Ultimate Reality. A common test of Truth is self-consistency. The plain man's test will comprise this, for his test implies consistency and harmony in the whole Life, the unity of Thought and Action. Another test given is: applicability to interpret new facts. This, too, is included; for the plain man's satisfaction means mastery, and mastery involves skill to deal with new situations and unforeseen emergencies. Resting, as it does,

on Ultimate Reality itself, the plain man's test will be found to comply with any of the demands to which an ultimate theory is usually submitted: Unity, Simplicity, Comprehension of all facts, Self-consistency. It is an appeal to Experience in the widest sense of that term, and has the repeated voice of History on its side. Mastery over the Given, bespeaking a development of the Spirit, and a full compliance with the demands of an Absolute Ideal, is thus one of the surest and best tests of particular truths it is possible for man to have. Resting on the view which makes Truth the revelation of Ultimate Reality, it has Ultimate Reality itself for its standing-ground, and no basis can be more sure.

All tests of Truth presuppose the Unity of the Spirit, and its dependence on the Absolute or Ultimate Reality through Absolute Ideals. Thus it is that Truth is one. The philosophic test which I have worked with throughout, presupposes these; for there must be a Spirit unifying *all that is in its experience*, and able to ask the question: What must be to account for all? But this presupposes that something *necessarily is*, that something is of itself; in other words, that there is an Ultimate Reality. When a man believes the word of a friend, or accepts the statements of historic witnesses, there is implied in his belief the conviction that men of approved character shape their lives and voice their opinions in accordance with Absolute Ideals, *i.e.*, with the Ultimate Reality. When a

scientific investigator does not rest satisfied with his theory till he sees it applied to the widest possible range of facts, and till he explain new and formerly unknown facts, he is but complying with the demand that there shall be a sure mastery of the Given, and but convincing himself that he has indeed pierced to some of the secrets which this Given may be made to reveal. In no other way could he comply with the demands of the Absolute Ideal, or be sure he has the Ultimate Reality to support his view. The mistake he sometimes makes, is to take the interpretation of the facts, viewed abstractly, for all that is involved in his theory and its tests. The Historic method of inquiry, which works back from the well known to the less known, from the present to the past, carries with it the test: What alone will account for these phenomena of man's history? But this presupposes the unity of the race, and the dependence of the men of old on the same Ideals as now rule our Progress; and it really amounts to: What view of the Absolute Ideals must be taken, to account for man's actions in any Given Past? Whatever be the test of Truth taken, it will be found to presuppose at least these two things: The Spirit of man is, and unifies all his experience; There is an Absolute whom the Spirit of man can know.

Necessary thought and necessary existence are postulates of our thinking and existence. It is folly to talk of proving everything mathematically. We cannot prove we are alive except by living;

we cannot prove we are moral except by being moral; we cannot prove we love except by loving. The necessary laws of Thought cannot be so proved; they are supposed in the very attempt which seeks to prove them. The Unity of Self-consciousness, and of the Spirit in all its acts, the trustworthiness of Memory and of our Spiritual Faculties and Activities, the principle of Causation, the principle of Sufficient Reason, and the presence of the Ideals in the Life,—these are ultimate facts, basal postulates, which cannot be demonstrated, yet are the bases of all demonstrations. Natural Science, as all other Sciences, rests on them; Thought, as Life, is impossible without them. They must be, they necessarily are, if Life and Thought are to be at all, and if man is to progress, and to prove himself capable of rising beyond all the attainments of the true, the wise, and the good, in the Past.

When a religious man sincerely exclaims: This I must believe, or Life is a lie, a fraud, and a madhouse, he has given a proof for his position which no sceptic can overturn. When a Luther cries out: Here I stand, I can do none other, he has reached a position of certitude such as no mathematical demonstration can give. The man who stands on the foundations on which alone Life, as an edifice of Truth, Reality, and inestimable Worth, can be built, need not fear any sneers at his lack of proof. The earth, the heavens, the physical universe, mathematics itself, are not more surely fixed and founded than he.

Truth and Morality. We have throughout taken Work to mean the moulding of a Given by the Spirit to express spiritual ends, and the striving to overcome, or the overcoming of, all difficulties or temptations which would prevent the accomplishment of this. This wide sweep of the term comprehends much that is usually left out: it comprehends thought, the act of judgment, and the act of pronouncing the judgment true or false. Any of us who have struggled to so order our thoughts that they will express what we wish expressed, and have tried, through revision and painstaking effort, to find sentences which are transparent to the thought in them, and to so link them that order, harmony, and cogency will be the result, need not a Carlyle to tell us that Thought is Work. Every distinct act of the Spirit, then, necessary to the realisation of its supreme ends, is an act of Work. Now every such act implies a choice, implies a Spirit free to go as it ought, or ought not, to go, implies an obedience to Absolute Ends. It is easy to show that, whatever be the view of Truth, Morality is ever implicated, unless we are dealing with views of Truth which treat it as a mere convention or as the invention of man, when there is certainly no Morality in the true sense; but then there is no Truth either. Morality, we take it, is the obedience to a higher than ourselves; it is the acknowledgment by us that we are under a supreme authority; it is an attitude of the Spirit which expresses such acknowledgment. Now if we accept the view of

Truth which confines it to the judgment, and defines it as: "The correct interpretation of facts," there is given all we want, to establish our present position. This view shows that there is an Ought in Truth, that there is an Absolute Ideal in it imposing its conditions on all men alike, and that man, in the pursuit of Truth, must take up an attitude of obedience to it. This attitude of obedience is Morality. Thus, on the narrowest view of Truth which still implies an Absolute, Morality is seen to exercise sovereign sway over all its domain. Morality is thus coextensive with the acts of the Spirit, that is, with Life itself; and now arises the question: Is Truth also all-inclusive? If Truth ever implies Morality, does Morality likewise imply Truth, or is there a domain of acts where Truth may not enter, and Morality is Lord alone?

If our interpretation of Truth is to be taken—it is the revelation of the Real through the mastery of the Given—then we must accept the absolute inseparability of Truth and Morality. Indeed, if Truth is not to be regarded as a Given, but as an expression of the Spirit's comprehension of the Real, it will be seen that it is absurd to speak of separating Truth from Morality. When we get rid of mechanical conceptions of the Spirit, when we come to understand what its unity means, we see how childish and foolish it is to talk of dividing it, or of separating act from act, or manifestation from manifestation. All of its activities and manifestations imply each other, and it is as a whole

that the Spirit works through any of them. Thus, then, if Truth be spiritual, if it be of the Spirit, who shall say that the Spirit can be manifesting itself anywhere and yet Truth be absent? Again, if the act of Judgment, and the reflective act of pronouncing on the Truth of the Judgment, are but acts of Work, and possess the same common features which belong to all acts of Work; and if, moreover, the reflective act which declares the Judgment to be true, is continually criticising every act of Life; it is hard to see why Truth should be confined to the Judgment alone. The immanent criticism which pronounces judgment on the Judgment, pronounces judgment on our own and others' acts as well, and declares of each and all how far it has realised the Truth. Our view is confirmed when we realise the Absolute nature of Truth, and its relation to Ultimate Reality. Is not my Truth my realisation of what Ultimate Reality is; and would I not have the Truth if I were one with Ultimate Reality throughout my being, if my will were in complete accord with His Will? Moreover, do we not strive towards this realisation through many activities and manifestations, through varied and progressive conquests of the Given? Has not every activity and manifestation its own Ideal, and is not the Truth in each secured, when it has fully complied with all the demands of the Ideal? Is he not the true man who ceaselessly seeks to know, and strenuously strives to obey, the demands of the Ideals everywhere? But, again, let us agree that Truth

belongs only to that immanent criticism which, itself an act, is the presiding genius over every act of the Spirit where true Work is done. Here, even if we allow an Ideal governing the reflective act, we cannot allow that this Ideal is not in unison with all other Ideals of the Life; we must say that if this Ideal be Truth, then Truth has to do with every act of Life, for in every act there is this immanent criticism. The Spirit is working, the same Spirit in working reflects on its own acts, in order to see if the ends of the Work are being secured; surely, since the Spirit is the same, its acts cannot be disunited, nor can it be said that, in one domain of Work, Truth reigns, in another, Morality.

Does not Life everywhere proclaim how vital is the connection between Truth and Morality? Can a man be good and yet have no or little regard for Truth, or is it possible for a man to attain Truth in any sphere and yet refuse to bow down to an Absolute? Can the man of impure thoughts and unclean life attain to a lofty standard of thought; can he, however brilliant his gifts and favourable his opportunities, reach the higher levels in his profession; or is it not that ere long, however secret his sin, he becomes a coward in the face of difficulties, and a moral and intellectual wreck? Did not a clandestine and improper intercourse shatter one of the strongest wills in contemporary history, and turn one of the most self-contained of men, whose policy till then had been so clearly defined, and so masterfully carried to a successful issue,

into a prematurely-old, shattered individual, who distrusted himself, mistrusted his fellows, and who, by his secretiveness, uncertain action, and utter want of tact, drove one of the most compact parties of Parliamentary history into warring factions? Is not all this "The Tragedy of Parnell," as painted by his friend and faithful henchman, Mr. T. P. O'Connor? The same tragedy is reflected from the pages of the history of every century, and can be seen by us enacted in lives which we know. Do we need Browning to tell us, in his "Andrea del Sarto," that the highest reaches, the inspired and inspiring touches, of the artist's craft is not for him who has sold his vision of the Ideal for the impure kiss of an unholy love? Is not the experience in every department of work what Religion has been crying through all the ages: He who will ascend the hill of God, who will indeed grasp the Ideal anywhere, must have clean hands and a pure heart? The Highest Teacher of all but added His testimony to this when He said: "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God." Let a man degrade his conception of the Ideals, let him indeed believe there is no Absolute in Truth, and act on his belief, and, ere long, all great efforts, all devoted enthusiasm, all sympathy for the heroic, and all capacity to attain to Truth in any inquiry, will be taken from him, and he will either drift into loose ways or become a cynical pessimist. Thus, in opposition to all artificial theories which would divorce Truth and Morality, Life utters its protest; and the decision

of its tribunal is final. Religion has, in its highest forms, maintained their divinely ordered union, and the experience of the common people has thrown into proverbs the same view. Acts speak louder than words, say the common folk; Christians are the living epistles of their Lord, says the Apostle Paul; the life of the Christian is the best proof of the truth of his Religion, is the cry of the pulpit; and people everywhere judge a man's Truth by what he does, more than by what he says.

Our whole contention goes for nought, if it is not clearly seen now that Truth is not merely intellectual; it is spiritual. The Spirit as a whole engages in the search and investigation of Truth. We may agree that Truth may be confined to the judgment, if it be understood that the judgment is a product of spiritual activity, and that the judgment which declares Truth has been gained, is the product of an immanent criticism which accompanies, and is a vital part of, every act of Life. When the judgment declares that Truth has been gained, the meaning is, that it has been gained by the spiritual activity or manifestation whose work is criticised. Truth must be taken as universal with the acts of the Spirit, and must never be defined in such a way as causes one to lose sight of its spiritual nature, or of the spiritual Ideals and spiritual Realities which it is merely the revelation of. Morality, too, we have found is universal, and coincident with Life. Yet Truth and Morality can be distinguished; for while Truth regards the mastery

of the Given which is being, or has been, effected, and the accompanying revelation of Reality, Morality regards the obedience to the Ideals through which the mastery is won. In that conquest, temptations, as we have seen, dispute every step taken, every move attempted, and the Spirit, in obedience to its ends, has to set itself to a sore warfare; but in that warfare its strength grows, and its mastery over every Given becomes more assured. It is winning a Character for itself, it is growing in those spiritual qualities or activities or dispositions called the Virtues. It is on this growth Morality keeps a watchful eye. But the growth of Character is the purpose of every manifestation; to this each is contributing, for this they are all united. Can we speak, then, of a special manifestation called Morality? With just the same right as we can of a special manifestation called Natural Science, or one called Art. Wherever the Spirit sets itself to conquer a particular form of the Given, and must continue so to set itself while the generations of humanity endure, there is a special manifestation. Morality has ever to overcome that Given called Self; it has ever to resist the temptations which, in all spheres of work, would induce the Spirit to set itself against the Absolute, or make itself an end to itself. This temptation meets man at every step, and hence it is that Morality embraces every act of Life.

Truth as Absolute and Eternal. If a man deny that there is any Absolute in Truth, we have seen

that we can refute him only by pointing out that there is an Absolute involved in his every statement, and that the system which comprises his basal positions—his philosophy—is ever thought of by him as an absolute foundation. He cannot indeed do other. To know the Relative we must know the Absolute, to know the temporary we must know the eternal, and it can be questioned if we know more of the one than of the other. Sir W. Hamilton gave out that the Absolute and the Infinite were but negative notions, and so expressive of nothing; but, as Professor Flint and others have shown, there can be no such notion as a negative one. There may be a negative term, but it is always expressive of a positive notion. A negative notion is a nothing, a pure nonentity, never thought of, imagined, or dreamed of. That which is thought of, is a positive thought; but that which must be thought of, which is implied in, and necessary to, all thought, must be the most positive of all notions, or the most real of all existences. Hamilton, Mansel, and Spencer have thought, by defining the Absolute as that which exists out of all relation to anything else, that they have thereby got rid of the Absolute from their thought; but one has only to look at their definitions, and at the absoluteness of their statements, to see that the Absolute is a positive notion to their thoughts as to everyone else, and that, through a false interpretation of the facts of existence, they have been led into manifold contradictions and mystifying conclusions.

But how can Truth be eternal, if man is constantly changing the forms into which he throws his Ideals ? The answer to this but leads us to an old position : Since Truth is of the Real, its eternal nature cannot be expressed by any form of the Given. Man's whole course, the course followed by the successive generations of men who have pursued a line of development, is unified by the Ideal aimed at. However contradictory at first sight may be the forms in which the Ideal has been expressed, the Ideal has been the same; and the successive generations, as the man himself in his successive efforts, have held it to be the one, indivisible, absolute, and eternal. Thus, in Natural Science, Art, Morality, and Religion can we unify what superficially appear the most contradictory theories, beliefs, and practices; and can account for what would otherwise be dark and mysterious. Thus it is that man cannot judge from the mere Given of the conduct of his neighbour, or of the men of the past; he must pierce deeper, and, by a spiritual insight and mastery of the Given, see what was striven for, what hindered, what has been overcome, and what has been gained. Thus is it, too, that man's duty is never to be content with what is, but to press on to what ought to be. "The things which are seen are temporal, but the things spiritual and unseen are eternal."

SEC. III. REASON.

Necessity for a New Definition of. In the latter part of the first section of the first chapter it was pointed out that among the terms which philosophers must re-shape the definitions of, in order that contradictions in their use may be avoided, none is more pressing in its claims than Reason. Two notable books of recent years may be mentioned as using the term in ways which mystify and confuse: these are Mr Kidd's *Social Evolution* and Mr Balfour's *Foundations of Belief*. It will clear the way for what follows if we state some of the contradictions these writers create for themselves through the ambiguous and unsatisfactory use of the term. Mr Kidd speaks of Religion as ultra-rational, and as supplying ultra-rational sanctions to an advance to which Reason is opposed. Rational conduct, with him, is purely selfish; and hence altruistic conduct is ultra-rational: it has its ends from another source than Reason. In the great socialistic advance of the present century, he sees a movement ever growing, of which Reason disputes every inch of the way, yet which, through ultra-rational sanctions, is daily winning adherents. There are in man's Spirit an ultra-rational region and a rational one; but how the Unity of Consciousness is to be maintained, if this be so, is a problem Mr Kidd does not seem to have faced. Nor does he see that, were the rational only the selfish, it would be impossible to speak of Reason

at all; for if we ascribe to man Reason, we mean that there is a common agreement between him and his fellows respecting something, and this can be only on the basis of a common nature and common ends; but to say that Reason implies this, is to upset Mr Kidd's theory. Reason, according to him, would wrap man up in Self, but Reason, since it must be occupied with something, is ever carrying man beyond Self, and is ever disclosing agreements between man and man. Mr Balfour at times opposes, or seems to oppose, Reason and Authority. As I understand it, by Reason he usually means the Abstract Reason, or Logical Reasoning; and by Authority he means "that group of non-rational causes, moral, social, and educational, which produces its results by psychic process other than reasoning." But as he cannot show that Abstract Reasoning provides its own grounds or standards, it is impossible for him to keep them opposite and separate. In spite of himself, as Professor Seth points out in *Man's Place in the Cosmos*, he is compelled to use authority as equivalent to the formed results of past reasoning, and to declare that the unification of all belief into an ordered whole, compacted into one coherent structure under the stress of reason, is an ideal which we can never abandon (p. 233). If I mistake not, the errors these writers fall into, are due to a loose notion respecting the nature of the Spirit, and the place and functions of Reason in its workings. If Reason be but the reflective act by the Spirit of its own working, or if it be taken as a spiritual

mode of activity, we cannot think of, or speak of, any influences on the Spirit, any reception or acting by the Spirit, any experience or psychic process to which Reason is wanting. Whether a man be under the sway of Authority, whether he be going right or going wrong, whether he be unselfish or selfish, whether he be religious or irreligious, Reason is present in all he does. To talk of anything as non-rational or ultra-rational in the sense that Reason is wanting to it, and then to treat of it and expound it as if Reason were immanent in it, and had grasped it throughout, is, when rightly viewed, as glaring a contradiction as it is possible for man to make.

Place and Function of Reason. What must be affirmed and reaffirmed, is the Unity of the Spirit. There can be no activity or manifestation of the Spirit in which the Spirit as a whole is not present, and Reason is but one mode of viewing the Spirit at work. For may we not say that Reason, Feeling, and Will are but different aspects of the same whole, different modes of viewing the Spirit in its work? The Will is but the Spirit viewed as active and striving for Ideals; Feeling is but its consciousness of its own development, and the peculiar changes which happen in this as the End is striven for or abandoned, gained or missed; and Reason is but the unfolding of the steps the Spirit has taken, is taking, or will take, to attain the End brought into consciousness, and the assuring by the Spirit of itself that it is justified in its action. Reason

but brings to light the logic immanent in the procedure of the Spirit. Allowing it to be the faculty of judgment, we hold it does not judge by standards of its own. To say so, is to make Reason an abstraction or an entity apart from the Spirit. Reason is but the Spirit criticising its own procedure in the light of its end. Reason does not assign its value to any spiritual activity or manifestation; its value is given it by its place in the Life, by its ministering to the ends of the Spirit. Each spiritual activity, when it follows its true end, is working rationally; when it departs from it, it is working irrationally. Thus, and thus only, can rational be defined. This does not mean that Reason is wanting to the latter; for the irrational and foolish man will have his reasons as well as the rational and prudent; but it gives Reason its right place in the Life. We have seen enough in our examination of the processes of the Spirit to know that these are not always carried on in the full blaze of consciousness, that the practical man arrives at his results, and the woman at her so-called intuitions, without conscious reasoning, and yet the whole procedure is neither non-rational nor supra-rational. The tests employed, and the satisfaction which accompanies the attainment of its end, are ample evidence to show that Reason has been at work from the beginning. People had not to wait till Aristotle exposed the syllogistic process to daylight, in order to reason correctly; nor have they to wait till Science attains its perfect form, before being assured they possess Truth and

know Reality. The more Reason is contemplated, the more clearly is it seen to be the name for that activity known as the Judgment, and that immanent criticism upon this and all other activities by which it is ascertained that Truth has been gained; and it is thus the mode of spiritual working which gives us the body of truths called Knowledge (common and other), all our Sciences, and Philosophy itself.

As false views of Reason are abroad, it is well to emphasise our position. As Judgment, Reasoning, and Cognition, it is sometimes hypostatised, and spoken of as if it were supreme judge of Truth, and arbiter in all decisions as to the value of work and of the different manifestations. Here the Unity of the Spirit is set at nought, and, as a consequence, the position is beset by clamant and invincible contradictions. For if Reason as judge be apart from the manifestations, one has to ask: Is there no reason immanent in them? If there be, how is it related to the other supreme Reason? If it can guide to Truth, what is the need of a separate Reason to pronounce on its work? Moreover, if the separate Reason have its own standards, how can its judgments be in accord with those of the immanent Reason? If, however, there is no Reason in any manifestation, how can the manifestation arise, how is it known, and how can a Reason external to it judge it? What tests can be sufficient to affirm that Non-Reason is true or false, real or unreal? Again, how can the same tests judge different manifestations striving towards different ends,

and having different forms of the Given to conquer? Are Art, Morality, Natural Science, and Religion to be weighed by the same balance, and measured by the same yardstick? How can a Reason which takes no account of the separate functions and their peculiar ends, be any judge of their Truth or the Reality they profess to reveal? Passing to those who speak of any activity or manifestation of the Spirit as non-rational or ultra-rational, we have to ask for a definition of terms, and presentation of their view of the Spirit. We presume they do not mean that any manifestation arises of itself, or apart from the Spirit. That being so, do they hold by the Unity of the Spirit or not? If they do not, one has to ask, how Truth, Knowledge, or Life is possible on this basis. If they do, as in self-consistency they must, how can they separate the rational manifestations or psychic processes from the non-rational or the ultra-rational? Can they determine of a living Spirit that its Reason can be separated from some or any of its modes of working or acts? Who will divide a living Spirit and yet keep its Unity? The absurdity of the position is clear when such a question is put. If the so-called non-rational and ultra-rational be products of the work of the Spirit, if they are of its Life, if they enter into its Experience, then Reason is in them, just as surely as the Spirit itself is in them. There is another class who, carried away by the success the Spirit has attained in some one manifestation, would make its methods and procedure dominate

and judge the methods and inquiries of all manifestations. They would squeeze Life into the one narrow channel. We have seen the Theologians guilty of this in the Middle Ages; we have seen some Natural Scientists guilty of it in our own time. Here, again, we must protest. If anything be of the Spirit, Reason is at work within it; it has its own ends, its own methods, and its own value for the Life. No manifestation can judge another—the absurdity of saying otherwise is evident when one sees that a manifestation is an abstraction apart from the Spirit; no one form of experience can judge another; it is the Spirit in each which alone can judge; and the only reasonable method of dealing with all manifestations of the Spirit, is to enter into their experiences, ascertain their ends and methods of procedure, and then endeavour to relate each to each, and to see in all a Unity of Life and Purpose.

Even if we view Reason as the faculty of Judgment, or as Reasoning inclusive of Naming and Judging, it will be found to be no mere intellectual process, but a work of the Spirit. When a man comes to a decision, his conclusion is not the result of mere reasoning or of a purely intellectual process. If, for example, he resolves to go abroad to a colony, it will be found that all his so-called reasons depend for their validity on the Ideals which have governed his Life and formed his Character, and that they are for him what they are, by virtue of his whole Experience. His apprehension of the difficulties

to be encountered is no work of mere intellect; it is *himself*, with his feelings, his strength, and his past experience, he supposes in the new, untried surroundings; his desires for the greater freedom, for the better chance to get on, for the freer opportunity of making a name for himself, have value only through the Ideals which have ruled his Life. So is it in every sphere, in every activity. No concept can be formed, no judgment asserted, which is the work of mere intellect. Each one expresses a unity which reflects the Unity of the Spirit, and each satisfies an Ideal which is no intellectual creation. The words we choose to express ourselves, our manner of combining them into sentences, are expressions of our Reason, but equally revelations of our Spirit. Define Reason as we choose, if we are true to facts, we must make it an activity in which the Spirit as a whole is engaged.

Understanding Reason thus, we can understand what can be meant by the ultra-rational, and the creativeness of Reason. The ultra-rational can mean only that which the Spirit must obey and believe, not because it is incomprehensible to it or external to itself, but because, while ever above, it is truly of itself, can be comprehended by itself through effort, and enables the Spirit to truly realise itself. Nothing can have influence on the Spirit which is entirely outside of itself, which is not of itself, into communion with which it cannot enter, or which its Judgment cannot grasp. The

ultra-rational in the ordinary sense is the Unknowable; if Religion be ultra-rational in this sense, it cannot be a manifestation of the Spirit, nor can we say anything about it. How the incomprehensible can enter the Spirit and influence it, is a psychical process never yet explained by those who speak of the ultra-rational. If a man call the Bible a Divine revelation, it is because of certain marks it bears, and of the relation its teaching has to his own spiritual Life, and not because it is beyond his Reason to understand; and if he call God the Trinity, and believe what he says, it is because he is compelled through facts of history, facts of revelation, and facts in his own spiritual experience, to think of God in this way. The so-called rational is as much above the Reason as is the so-called ultra-rational. Are not the constitution of Spirit, its necessary methods of procedure, the number and kinds of its manifestations, the Ideals, and the nature of the Given, all equally ultra-rational; yet, from another point of view, are not all equally grasped and comprehended by Reason? The Spirit as Judgment and Reasoning does not then create the necessary Laws or modes of its procedure. These are the expressions of those demands which the Spirit must meet, if it will have Thought at all. The necessary Laws of Thought are but expressions for the general procedure the Spirit must adopt in order to make Thought possible. What, then, do we mean by the Creativeness of the Spirit; what can and does the Spirit create?

The Spirit creates the forms which embody the Ideals, creates those forms which express its mastery over the Given, creates the births and growths of its development, and creates that Character which reveals itself and all these. The man who makes a new tool, a new invention, a new law, a new institution, a new word, a new thought, has brought that into being which was not before ; and the value of his creation and its relation to the laws of Eternal Reason, are at once seen in its value for the development of the Spirit of man. The new message of the poet, thinker, sage, or prophet, is a true creation ; the Spirit in it bursts into a new life, and all who have ears to hear the message, know that it has widened Life for them, and through it they are called, as through a new birth, into a wider and grander Life.

Of the right use of the Judgment and Reasoning we need say little. What the Spirit takes with it as its basal postulates, as its conception of Ultimate Reality, will be found to govern and guide the whole construction. Kant works throughout his system on the assumed postulate that Nonmena and Ultimate Reality are beyond the reach of the human intellect; and Hamilton, Mansel, and Spencer have tried to find a place for Religion in a philosophic system resting on the same basis ; but the Logic immanent in this system can find no place for Religion, if the Unity of the Spirit and self-consistency are to be maintained. The subterfuge which Hamilton and Mansel adopted, of distinguish-

ing between Faith and Reason, and asserting that through Faith a man may believe in the Unknowable and the Self-Contradictory, sets both of these necessary principles at defiance. The most destructive criticism which can be passed on their arguments, is the exhibition of the inconsistency of their conclusions with their premises and with necessary postulates of thought, and of the inability of their own definitions to cover portions of what they allege to be experience. A system must be consistent throughout, it must not violate any experience, nor must it do violence to any of the necessities on which Thought and Life rest. This is the criticism which the Spirit must subject its work to, in framing the system, and this is the criticism it must be able to stand from others. Hence the importance of training the Spirit in criticism of its own work, and hence the importance of tracing back any theory to the presuppositions on which it rests. If a man affirm there is no truth in Religion, one must ask his definition of Truth, and so determine his presuppositions; if he declare that Matter is all, one must determine his criterion of Reality, and the postulates he bases his assertion on; or if, sitting down in despair, he declares Reason is impotent to resolve the contradictions of Life, and the strength of man incapable of overcoming its difficulties; a careful inquiry must be made as to what he understands by Reason, and how he expects the contradictions of Life to be resolved. When a man's presuppositions and definitions are

known, then they can be brought to the great touchstone of Experience, and the question can be asked: Are they just to Experience? Till they are known, all discussion and argument are useless, and it is hopeless to think that either side can understand the other. The theory which best interprets Experience, which brings to light the Reality which makes Life stable, gives strength for to-day, and hope for to-morrow, and which not only deals with the Is but with the Ought, and so widens and ennobles Life by pointing to its infinite and still unrealised possibilities,—this is the theory which alone can stand the tests of theoretical consistency and of practical experiment. Such a theory is the best proof of what the right use of the judgment and Reasoning can accomplish.

Its Relation to Feeling. Every so-called Feeling is an activity of the Spirit, has an Ideal immanent within it, and is criticised by means of that Ideal through the Reason immanent in the Feeling. The Spirit as a whole is present in the Feeling, and is exercising a criticism on its own procedure here as elsewhere. The criticism of the views of those who place Feeling in opposition to the Reason, and who speak of arguments of feeling, will best exhibit how stable is our own position. In his *Outlines of Psychology* Höffding speaks as follows:—"Even if Science explained the whole universe according to its laws, it would not be able to prevent feeling from postulating, as a basis for this whole system of causes and effects, a highest

teleology, beyond our powers of conception. The final questions with which views of Life are concerned, the questions of the value and significance of reality and of Life, are decided in the last resort according to the dictates of feeling. This is clearly shown in the present day by the great importance obtained by the opposition between the optimistic and pessimistic views of life. In the last resort, our own inmost nature and personal experience of life decide the issue" (Eng. Transl. p. 302). A more loose use of the term *feeling*, a greater confusion of the psychological and the philosophical points of view, it would be hard to imagine. It is no wonder that ordinary writers take psychological distinctions for real separate entities, when a writer of such acknowledged authority leads the way. Whether he is speaking as a psychologist or as a philosopher, his language is inconsistent with his own definitions, and both misleading and mischievous. As a psychologist he has defined feeling: "Every feeling is characterised by the strong contrast between pleasure and pain" (p. 222); and he has taken care to warn us against supposing that any feeling is exclusive of the intellect:—"So that it is only an abstraction to speak of pure feeling without any cognitive element. It is, however, allowable to employ such an abstraction as theoretical basis. . ." (p. 234). As a psychologist he cannot, therefore, speak of "feeling postulating a highest teleology," nor can he identify it with "our inmost nature and personal experience of life," as he does here.

As a philosopher he clearly points out that Intellect, Feeling, and Will are inseparable, so that his language is as loose and erroneous from this point of view as from the former. Like all such language, it is misleading and pernicious; it lends countenance to loose current views that, in the final issue, Religion and Philosophy rest on mere Feeling, and that they have no such stable basis as Natural Science. Feeling, as psychologically defined, *postulates* nothing, *decides* nothing, and is not to be identified with "our inmost nature and personal experience of life." The final questions with which views of life are concerned, are decided by what must necessarily be thought to be. Their answers rest on the most stable of all foundations: that without which Life would be impossible; and this foundation is neither the work nor the discovery of mere feeling, but of the Spirit working as Reason, Feeling, and Will.

We can see the same loose and misleading use of terms in current literature. Let me quote from Mrs Orr's *Life and Letters of Robert Browning*:—"It was a matter of course that, in this expression of his dramatic genius, the intellectual and emotional should exhibit the varying relations which are developed by the natural life: that feeling should begin by doing the work of thought, as in *Saul*, and thought end by doing the work of feeling, as in *Fifine at the Fair* . . ." (p. 340). When one carefully considers the utterance, he may well wonder what ideas of thought, feeling, and the

Unity of the Spirit are abroad; he may well ask, what profit has been all the psychological analysis and philosophical insight of the century; and he may well demand an authoritative definition of these terms. When one, eager to understand this strange phenomenon of *feeling doing the work of thought*, turns to Mrs Orr's *Handbook to Browning's Works*, to read what her thought has to say of the poem, in which, if she be logical, she must affirm there is no thought, he finds that she unfolds the argument of the poem, and traces the different steps by which David strove to raise the depressed monarch's thoughts from himself, and to rouse him to take a new interest in life, by pointing out its goodness, its glory, its earthly and its heavenly immortality. Here surely the thought of Mrs Orr is finding not a work of *feeling*, but is interpreting the *thought* of the poem; it is thought she is dealing with all the time—a thought which takes up both feeling and will into itself—but she does not know it. Even the part of the poem which would lend most justification to her words, is an argument based on the love of man and its Ideal: God's love cannot be less than man's. If the learned authoress were to fathom the depths of love, and so learn all that is implied in it and its Ideal, she would never again talk of "feeling doing the work of thought."

The so-called argument or judgment of feeling is no pronouncement of feeling in the psychological sense of that term—nonsense or absurdity cannot reach a greater length than the assertion that it

is; it is either the utterance of the Spirit viewed as reason working in the feeling, or it is an argument based on feeling as an activity of the Spirit and all this implies. One has yet to learn that Reason is wanting to either utterance, or that the facts on which the argument rests, are not more indubitable than those of Natural Science, seeing they are the fundamental facts on which all facts rest. But is there not a conflict at times between the head and the heart, and do we not find it wiser to listen now to the head and again to the heart? Such a conflict is seen in a case of charitable giving, where the heart would prompt to instantaneous help, while the head asks that the circumstances of the case be inquired into, in order that the true end of charity be gained. Here we have not feeling opposed to reason, but we have the Spirit viewed as rashly, and as deliberately, fulfilling an end. It is the same conflict which meets us in Natural Science, where the investigator is tempted to take a result of Observation or Experiment, without further testing, for what it seems to be. In the attainment of his ends man is required to use every item of his knowledge, every ounce of his experience; he is required, as we have seen, to walk critically, and to test every step. In the case of Charity a natural prompting is to deal with the matter without due thought; but the Spirit is called on to criticise this, and to see if in this way the true end of Charity can be attained. The so-called conflict between the head and the heart resolves

itself into the old conflict of resistance to any temptation which would prevent the attainment of the Ideals. This temptation may attack us from the side of the "head," as from that of the "heart," as when a man deliberates so long on a course of action that the time for action is past before he can make a decision. When David Deans was pulled in opposite directions by his religious creed and by the promptings of his parental affections, so that he could not decide how he should treat his erring Effie, the conflict arose from the immanent criticism of his Spirit demanding him to consider whether his creed really interpreted the law of God or not. It pointed to a contradiction between the law of God as interpreted by his creed, and that same law as written on the fleshly tablets of his heart, and he could not have peace till he had reconciled these, or subordinated the one to the other. But there was no argument of pure feeling here; the conflict could be more appropriately styled that between a narrow and a wide reason; or between an old form in which the Spirit had thrown its beliefs on Duty, and a developed Spirit finding this form unsuitable and scanty for its growth.

Reason and Authority. According to the view here set up, there can be no opposition between Authority and Reason, in the sense that Authority is something apart from, and other than, Reason. Mr Balfour, in his *Foundations of Belief*, would assert the opposite:—"Authority, as I have been using the term, is in all cases contrasted with

Reason, and stands for that group of non-rational causes, moral, social, and educational, which produces its results by psychic processes other than reasoning" (p. 219). Here he uses Reason as equivalent to reasoning, but this does not allow him to call any causes operating on the growth of mind and character, non-rational. Since Reasoning implies a Spirit active in it, were we to take Mr Balfour logically, he would assert that the non-rational is opposed to the Spirit. How that which is opposed to, contrasted with, or other than, the Spirit can yet mould the Spirit and develop it, is a problem which one may say is insoluble and unthinkable. Mr Balfour would be the first to confess, I imagine, that the Spirit can apprehend, learn, and be influenced, only according to its own constitution, along the lines of its own activities, of its own peculiar bents, and of its own free will and activity; he would also confess that Reasoning, being an activity of the Spirit, is never absent from that Spirit, but is at work wherever the Spirit itself is at work: this being so, how can he speak of "psychic processes other than reasoning" producing results, or of Authority as a "group of non-rational causes"? Does he mean that there is neither Reason nor Reasoning in the educational influences of Authority, as exercised by parent, teacher, or Society through the medium of newspaper, books, laws, social and political institutions, and the Church; and that the child is influenced by all without Reason or Reasoning on his part? Surely not. There is Reason

and Reasoning on both sides. Let us not be carried away by an abstraction; as we have seen already, Authority is but the voice of the past and of older contemporaries speaking to us through the achieved performances and masteries of the Spirit; and the learners can hear the voice and understand the meaning because of their spiritual powers and Ideals. That which has been done, they can do; that which was striven for and attained, they too can strive for. Law, Government, Discipline, Knowledge—all speak to them, because they can discern the Reason and the Reasoning in all; because, in all alike, they can perceive the Spiritual, and can see that it is by such masteries, such use of means, the Spirit can gain its ends. The boy in school finds the discipline of school irksome at times; but "there are no boys," says one great educational authority, "who do not like to be well governed," and this is because of the very reason and reasonableness of the discipline. Who that watches a parent or teacher in their own spheres, can say that reason or reasoning is wanting to their work, and who that notes how the Spirit of man is influenced, can say that any cause operating upon it is non-rational? Mr Balfour has probably in his mind's eye the great mass of the common people, who are said to receive the traditions of their fathers without questioning or criticism, and who are said to believe whatsoever the preacher, the newspaper editor, and the statesman of their sect and party choose to tell them. That there is a myth of this kind abroad,

we are well aware; but one had thought Mr Balfour was too well acquainted with the religious, social, and political movements of the time to accept it for truth. On what question do the young receive the teaching of their fathers without criticism? In a progressive community such as our own, how can the present simply accept uncritically what the past chooses to teach? To assert they do, is to deny progress. Does not progress ever imply and involve a criticism of the forms in which the Ideals have been shaped, a discontentment with present attainments, and a reaching out to an Ideal not yet attained? What do all the progressive movements in religious beliefs, in Benefit Societies, in temperance reform, in the relation of Labour to Capital, in political freedom, and in the sense of Human Brotherhood which have marked the last half-century, betoken, if not a development of the Spirits of the common people and a growth of their Reason? Authority, we can say, is embodied Reason; and so far is it from being opposed to Reason that it is continually giving its reasons for assuming the attitude it does. It represents the Spirits of the past, and it leads the young along the road which the feet of the toilers of the past have trodden smooth, after their leaders had mapped it out and led the way. But Reason has tested every step of that advance, and has assured man after each test that he is indeed progressing. To assert the opposite is to maintain that Chance began the progressive movement, that Reason has been wanting

to the spiritual progress of the past, and that the Spirit of man can work and progress without the activity of Reason. He who does this, opens the door to scepticism, for if Chance and Non-Reason were sufficient to guide our fathers, why should they not suffice for us? As we have pointed out before, to assert that the Spirit in the past did not assure itself of every position gained and held by it, is to deny to it that critical reflection which is its indefeasible birthright; is, in fact, to assert that it was other than, and different from, the Spirit of man in the present. Those who talk of the influence of Custom and Authority in early times, rarely ask themselves the question: Whence had this Custom and Authority their origin, and what gave them their influence? The right answering of this would reveal that they themselves were the creations of the Spirit, and owed their influence to their spiritual character.

No doubt Authority can become a fetish, a mere Given opposed to the spiritual advance of man. This is the temptation in connection with it which those who exercise it and those who are influenced by it, have to combat. For if Authority does not itself rest on Ultimate Reality, on the Truth of Things which man has won, it is indeed false and hurtful. Hence Authority must ever give reasons for its existence, must make clear to the growing minds that it expresses Truth and is based on Ultimate Reality; this, even false and hypocritical Authorities pretend to do. Authority which refuses

to give or cannot give such reasons for itself, is a tyranny, a Given to be conquered and re-shaped. How far man must bow to authority in customs, laws, moral and religious usages, and how far he must diverge from them or oppose them, is for each generation and each individual a problem to be solved by the growth and progress made by it or him, and by this alone.

Reason and Intuition. Intuition is sometimes put in contrast with Reason. It is loaded with the highest honours and given a place above Reason itself, as when we speak of the insight of the poet and the seer; at other times it is spoken of with a half-veiled contempt, as when we speak of a woman's intuition. In the one case, Reason is transcended by a flash of inspiration; in the other, it is hinted that the conclusion is gained by some mysterious operation of the feelings; while, in both cases, it is agreed that a correct result can be arrived at by processes other than those of conscious reasoning. Now we have to note that such an occurrence does not belong to any one walk of Life or any one class of people. The Natural Scientist has his visions as well as the poet: there comes to him at times a flash of insight, by which he sees the hypothesis or theory which will bring a multitude of scattered facts into unity, or by which the problem which has so long baffled his most concentrated and persistent efforts, presents itself to his mind with its own solution. The preacher looks out his text on Monday, and, beyond a few thoughts, thinks not of

his mode of treatment; on Friday or Saturday, when he comes to write out his sermon, the full and perfected form sometimes presents itself to him, and he feels as if he were writing the thoughts of another man. So in ordinary Life we speak of sleeping on a knotty problem, diverting the attention to something else, in the hope that an interval of rest may enable the mind to find that which it is in search of, or that the solution itself may present itself without further thought. A well-known American professor says that he thinks best about a subject when he busies himself about something else. Paradoxical as this statement may seem, it expresses a phenomenon of mind which many know in their own experience. Some minds, when deeply occupied with a theme, can do better work in it, if they turn from concentrating themselves on it to read another subject, it may be akin or different. As they read, suggestions, illuminating thoughts, and systematic methods of treating the former subject, start, as of themselves, into being, rise like Athene from the head of Zeus, full-formed, beautiful in their perfection, and radiant with a glorious light.

In all these cases a right conclusion is arrived at by processes which do not submit themselves to the ken of conscious vision; but if we are to maintain the Unity of the Spirit, we must believe that they are in nowise different from those which, at other times, toil uphill so laboriously before they can attain their goal. One thing we are assured

of—these intuitive results come only to the seeking Spirit; it is not to the careless worker, but to the diligent and aspiring, that the rewarding vision comes. He only can appreciate it; he only can be sure it speaks the Truth. And it comes to him because his Spirit has travailed in sore pain to bring it into being. In the work of seeking, in the attempts at solution or discovery, in the trials and experiments, the Spirit has grown, and become equal to the task of removing the difficulty. The Ideal striven for has become clearer, and what is wanted is understood. Hence the flash of recognition, the triumph of satisfaction when the solution appears, or when the road to the goal is thrown open. To speak here as if the process involved were mysterious or altogether different from the processes of so-called conscious thought, is to be blind to the mystery which surrounds every activity of our conscious life. Mystery and miracle surround every act of the common daily round of work, if we but open our eyes to see; we need not place them in the uncommon and the unfamiliar. Has not Tennyson said that every flower holds within it the mystery of the Universe; and has not Professor Max Müller as truthfully said that every birth has within it the mystery of the Incarnation? We do not perform the operations of everyday life in the full blaze of consciousness. Suggestions, temptations, impulses arise, we know not how. Few of us are aware of our own greatness, of all we are capable of doing. Where do the thoughts

come from that crowd the pages of a great writer? When he sat down to write, he was not aware of the possession of them all. Thackeray always thought, when he had finished a novel, that he was incapable of writing another, that he was utterly exhausted of material. Often in writing he marvelled where the thoughts came from; and his experience led him to advise every writer not to shirk writing, for it was impossible for him to say what he was capable of, till he tried. Life is not a psychological manual, in which idea succeeds idea in orderly array, and the appropriate feeling waits as attendant, to introduce at the right moment the action suited to the occasion. There are warring impulses, disorderly trains of thought, appetites and needs at strife; and every step of the way presents itself as a problem. Often we have to walk through thick darkness, guided by faith alone. Thus Intuition is no whit more mysterious than is Life itself.

Intuition, then, is the arriving at a conclusion or truth by so rapid or so unconscious a working of the activities of the Spirit that it appears more as an insight than as the result of a process. The conclusion is at once recognised as the right one, and this often with a certainty which later tests cannot strengthen. But since tests can be used for it, and since its basis and the reasons for believing it can be given, we have a proof of the presence of Reason and Reasoning in this as in every mental act, and of the criticism which is immanent in

every spiritual process. The flash of recognition is only possible to a Spirit which has Ideals to satisfy, and is conscious of their satisfaction as the test of truth. There is no need to put Intuition beyond the pale of Reason, or to put it in opposition to ordinary spiritual process. Intuition certainly is not the work of mere reasoning, but in Life there is no such work; there is ever a Spirit working for Ends, and capable of knowing what will satisfy these Ends; in Intuition we have nothing more. It is opposed to reasoning in the sense that it often means the Spirit's awareness of itself, and all that involves. That a man knows himself, is not the product of any thought, feeling, or willing, or of any act of judgment or reasoning; that a man knows himself only through the Absolute, is the deepest fact in our nature, but is not reached by any logical process. No amount of talk about the Spirit can give a man self-knowledge, and no argumentation about the Divine can enable a man to know God. In that sublime act of consciousness when the Spirit sees both itself and God, Reason, Reasoning, and Judgment are within the act, for the Spirit which is all these or can exercise them all, is present; the certitude of the vision is placed beyond all doubt: were it not true, man could believe no act of his Spirit, his ordinary acts must be those of a madman; Life is illumined throughout by the meaning the vision casts on its humblest acts; the nobility and infinite range of its possibilities, and the perfection of the Character it may attain, stand revealed as

never before. In such a moment the Spirit does not lose its consciousness, but that consciousness is intensified so that its long range of past deeds stands before its enlarged vision; and its knowledge of its own weakness, folly, and sinfulness, stands against the Infinite Strength, Wisdom, and Holiness. The scales drop from its eyes, and it can discern the Real from the Non-Real, the Spiritual from the Non-Spiritual, and see all things in their true value. Such is Intuition in its loftiest attainment, but we could just as truthfully call the act one of self-conscious Reason; it is all the activities of the Spirit focused to one centre, and conscious of what makes them what they are.

Nothing I have said is designed to minimise the work of conscious reflection, or to undervalue a single activity of the Spirit in its normal vocation; nor do I wish to elevate the unconscious workings of the Spirit over the conscious. Man in his work has to make certain that each step is taking him towards the desired goal; and so provides himself with tests which correspond to the demands of the Ideals, and of a Spirit Universal and Absolute over all men. These tests he must consciously employ; but to the honest worker who has disciplined all his powers, and is ever striving to know the Truth and to obey its demands, there come illuminating moments when a new revelation bursts in on his Spirit, satisfying all its tests at one and the same moment, and carrying with it all the light of Truth itself. Such is the illumination which enables a

man to see himself and Reality at the period known as Conversion; such is the flash of Truth which comes to every prodigal son at the turning-point of his career; such was the flood of light which illuminated Life and the Universe when Carlyle, brooding over doubt and contemplating suicide, opened his eyes to see the place of Work in Life; such is the glory which fills the soul of poet, painter, and writer when the vision which has so long eluded the mental grasp, stands before them as a breathing form, and, holding out hands and feet, turns round so that every part in its perfection and harmony can be distinctly seen and realised; and such, too, in lesser degree, is the light of certitude in which the practical man, the man of tact, and the woman called on to make frequent and rapid decision in the home, often see their decisions. It is little wonder that Emerson said that any day was worthily lived in which one such illuminating thought came to a man. This light, this Intuition, is Reason seeing itself at once in all its relations. The very framework, constitution, and foundations of Reason stand revealed; and the decision is found to be in harmony with all, and to be in harmony with that Eternal Truth whose design Reason itself both is, and is seeking to reveal. Intuition, then, does not ignore facts, but is, on the contrary, the right interpretation of them. It does not oppose reasoning, but stands on the same basis of absolute certainty as reasoning rests on; it is judgment, imagination, feeling, and willing, in concentration and in unison,

for it is of the Spirit, which can be all these at one and the same time. In its highest reaches it does not tempt one to mistake a process for the worker, the Given for Reality, for it brings one into direct contact with the Real Spirit and the Ultimate Reality. Yet Intuition, too, has its temptation—that of despising the slow and laborious processes by which alone it is itself possible, and of spending the time in idleness, awaiting supernatural intervention, instead of disciplining the Spirit by a mastery over the Given and an obedience to the demands of the Absolute in every line of its activities and manifestations, by which conscious effort alone it is made capable of those supreme efforts of intuitive insight, and by which alone it can not only see their value, but can use them for further development, and for the fuller attainment of Supreme Ends.

CHAPTER IV.

RELIGION IS A MANIFESTATION OF THE SPIRIT.

SEC. I. INTRODUCTORY CONSIDERATIONS.

WE are not here concerned with any particular form of Religion, but with it in its universal aspects. Since the days of Cicero to the present time, thinkers on Religion who have endeavoured to catch its universal aspects in a definition, have differed to the point of contradiction. Many of these were led astray by a false psychology or by erroneous views of mind, and so, according to the side or aspect of the Spirit which appeared most prominent in Religion, they affirmed it to be the offspring of the Reason, or of the Feeling, or of the Will. In so doing they denied the Unity of the Spirit, and yet all agreed in affirming it to be a spiritual manifestation. All were agreed in maintaining that Religion aims at the apprehension and knowledge of a transcendent Object, that this apprehension and comprehension is the work of mind, that this Object is Supreme Spirit, having authority over all the acts of man, and that Religion strives so to rule man's

obedience that all his Life will declare the glory and love of Him whom he serves. In our own century, and especially in its latter half, the interest in Religion, in historical, comparative, and critical investigation into its nature and its Sacred Books, has grown with each decade; and it may well be questioned if Natural Science has made a greater advance than has Religion. More and more it has been recognised that if Religion issues from the Spirit of man, and blends and mingles with his whole Life, it must be viewed as a Manifestation of the Spirit. Compelled by the sheer stress of facts, by the part Religion has played, and is ever playing, in the individual and social Life, thinkers of all schools have been compelled to root it in the Spirit of man. They may place it only in the Imagination, or they may ascribe to its source a distinct sphere of Consciousness, as Herbert Spencer does; but they are compelled to admit that Religion is, somehow or other, necessary to man. Such an admission, coupled with the acknowledgment of the Unity of the Spirit, is enough, I consider, to establish all my subsequent conclusions. Religion, I hold, is a Manifestation of the Spirit, in that, in it, the Spirit ever pours itself forth as Knowledge, Feeling, and Action in indissoluble union; in that it has relations to all Manifestations, reveals the nature of their source, and so interprets their work and results that the Reality they all reveal and their essential unity can be easily discerned; and in that it springs from a necessity of man's Spirit, can furnish the reasons

for its existence, and can make clear that without it man is not fully and truly man.

This naturalness of Religion, its necessity to man's complete nature, its everlasting foundations in the constitution of man's Spirit, as well as in the ground of All That Is, are illustrated by the impotence of all attempts Naturalism has yet made to account for the origin of Religion, and for its significance and place in the Life of man. Its existence is a fact, its potent influence in the advance of man is a fact, and its vital connection with every feature, or movement, or part of that advance is another weighty fact. No one loves facts more than the Naturalist; the question for him, as for everyone, is: How are these facts to be explained? Denying to man a Spirit, seeking to account for everything by the Given, Naturalistic thinkers have resorted to all the explanations of the origin of Religion possible within these limits. Formerly they considered it was enough to ascribe to man a personifying tendency or an anthropomorphic bias. They overlooked that it is this tendency or bias which demands explanation. Till it is accounted for, till we know whether it is a healthy or a diseased mode of mental operation, till we see its place in the Unity of the Spirit, all talk about Personification and Anthropomorphism is either a begging of the question or is beside the point at issue. Then Totemism and the worship of Ghosts and of Dead Ancestors were hopefully advanced as satisfactory theories. A family takes the *bear* for its emblem

or sign or totem; by and by, feelings of reverence and awe gather round it; the descendants have forgotten the origin of the symbol; they come to regard themselves as children of the bear, and do worship before its sign: the totem is regarded as, or is a symbol of, God. The same fallacy which lurks in these, is concealed in Fetishism and in all naturalistic theories. In all alike the question is begging, by passing over the very point to be explained, the fact of facts in the whole matter, which is: What is there in man which compels him to ascribe immortality to his Spirit, which compels him to worship Spirits or a Spirit deemed higher than himself, which has ever refused to let him see the source of All in the Given simply because it deems itself not of the Given, and which at the beginning enabled him to come by such a conception as that of God? This point is pressed home again and again by Professor Max Müller in his Gifford Lectures. If my boy comes to me, he says, and calls his stick an invertebrate animal, it is not the predicate as applied to the stick we seek to explain, but whence he came by it. To say that the primitive people called anything a God, and not explain how they came by such a predicate, is to leave out the crux of the whole question. Words mean something; they have a reference to existence or reality; each is a product of man's experience, and carries both subjective and objective implications; each and every one has a history reflecting the growth and changes in that experience; they do not hang

in the air. Whence, then, comes the concept—God; what is there in man which causes him to arrive at such a concept; if man be only of the Given, how can he come by such a notion? These are awkward questions for Naturalism to handle; but, as Herbert Spencer has recognised, they are the questions which must be met by any theory pretending to embrace all the facts. He himself has acknowledged, in the opening part of his *First Principles*, that, in order to deal fairly with them, there must be ascribed to man a special mode of Consciousness, the Religious Sentiment; and as it could not have existence without a special object in the environment, there must be an object other than that apprehended by the Scientific Consciousness, which he calls the Unknowable. Were there time and were this the place, it would be easy to show that Spencer, in spite of this admission, has been led by a naturalistic bias to explain away this Religious Sentiment, to so treat of Religion and its Object that he makes of the latter that of which nothing can be thought or uttered, and in the end to contradict the admission with which he set out. Had he understood Kant's great thought, the Unity of the Spirit; had he been able to realise that Reason is at work in every mode of Consciousness; and that the Spirit in any such mode cannot apprehend, or conceive of, that which is beyond its powers, or is opposed to its constitutive principles and modes of action; he would not have fallen into such errors and contradictions. The importance

of his admission, however, must not be overlooked, that no theory which denies to Religion a natural and necessary place in the constitution of man and in the constitution of the Universe, can hope to account for the facts which Religion presents.

Let us follow Professor Max Müller for a little, as he brings home to us how eternally sure, how living and how ever-abiding, are those constitutive principles and movements of man's Spirit from which Religion springs. He has just been transcribing a graphic picture of the savagery, the dulness, and the stupidity with which *Homo sapiens* began, from the pen of Professor Huxley, and he is commenting in his own masterly fashion:—"The greater the savagery, the dulness, the stupidity with which *Homo sapiens* began, the greater the marvel, at what must have been from the first, though undeveloped, in him, and made him in the end what we find him to be in the men of light and leading of our own age. For whether he asked his Whence or Whither, while browsing as yet on the lichens of glacial fields with his less erect compatriots, the mammoth, the urus, the lion, and the hyena, or whether that question was first asked during a post-glacial period, certain it is that he alone asked it, and that he alone tried to answer it in the end by what we call the cosmological argument. That very question may be illogical, and every attempt to answer it still more illogical. But why will people not see that the mere fact of such a question being asked, and being asked at a time when as

yet there was no Bible, no creed, no dogma, is something that ought to make us reflect. Why did man of all his hairy compatriots ask that question, Whence? Why was he surprised, when no one else was? Why was he not satisfied with the fulness of life and enjoyment like his fellow-creatures, the mammoth, the urus, the lion, and the hyena? Can we ever imagine a mammoth saying to himself, Who is my Father? . . . Can we imagine even the most favoured specimen of the so-called Pithecanthropos, the ape-man, uttering the question, Whence comes this world? . . . It is in that question, in the power of asking that question, that the true nerve of the cosmological argument lies. Man is so made that he cannot be satisfied with mere perceptions, but must proceed to ask whence they come. Philosophers may tell us that it is a very foolish and illogical question to ask; but it is not the fault of the nightingale that it sings, nor is it the fault of man that he asks, Whence? There is no power on earth to stop that question, not even the power of logic. The answers themselves, as I said before, are far less important, but they are interesting nevertheless as showing us the historical development of the human mind when brought face to face with that Whence."[1] The Professor, I fancy, in his reference to "the power of logic," and the "foolish and illogical question," is having a little pleasantry at the expense of certain philosophers; for how can logic prove any fact of human

[1] *Natural Religion*, pp. 243–245.

nature, any constant element of man's spiritual nature, or any expression of the activity of this in deed or word, to be illogical? But he does not fail to make it clear that Religion springs from a movement of man's Spirit in which it is seeking to know itself, its origin, its mission in the world, and its destiny; that this movement is the root out of which all Religions have branched; that it is at work in the Spirit of man to-day, and must ever be at work in that Spirit, and that, if he will not be led by it to see his Creator and Sustainer in a Supreme Spirit, he must, in order to stifle or drug it, worship himself or an idol of his own creation. Man must, to be truly man, behold himself made, led, inspired, and ruled by an Absolute and Infinite Spirit. Man has been so made, is so constituted, that he cannot but ask the questions of which all the creeds and ceremonies of the various Religions of the world are the answers. If all the facts of man's nature are to be honestly dealt with, this bend or tendency or make of his constitution must not be passed over. When artificial and mechanical conceptions of man's Spirit are seen in their ineptitude and falsity, and when the nature of the Spiritual, as authoritative over the Given, is apprehended, the power and tendency in it to grasp the Absolute and Infinite can lead to but one conclusion respecting the origin and nature of Religion, and its ability to lead man to Truth.

Religion is grounded in the constitution of man as Spirit. It is, because he is what he is. Grasping

the Unity of Spirit, we can see that every manifestation by which the Spirit has ever rushed forth to the conquest of the Given, and to attain development and perfection of nature, must remain an abiding manifestation. Standing on this Unity and on the whole teaching of History, we can declare the incontrovertibility of the following propositions:—Whatever has been essential to man's Progress, which is rational, must itself be rational; whatever manifests itself as a necessity of man's nature, or springs naturally from his constitution and ministers to his highest well-being, must ever remain necessary to his well-being and Progress. If it can be established that Religion has had the slightest influence on man's Progress; if it has ever helped man to fight his battles, to surmount his difficulties, to inspire him to a greater and a nobler development, its inherent rationality and its indefeasible right to a place in the constitution of things must be at once granted. If it has sprung from a movement of man's Spirit,—and from what other source could it spring?—if this movement had a distinct manifestation, embodying itself in peculiar and distinctive institutions, beliefs, and practices; if this manifestation went through the phases of a development, when can we say that this movement shall end, or what meaning can we attach to the statement that it can end? Any movement of the Spirit by which the Spirit reveals itself and strives after self-revelation, self-knowledge, self-development, and the apprehension of Reality, has Reason within it;

how or when can such a movement have an end? Can Spirit be mechanically divided, can it be cut in twain or partitioned off in compartments? Can Memory, or Imagination, or Reasoning, or Natural Science, or Morality, or any Activity or Manifestation, cease to be, and yet the Spirit continue to live, act, and grow? If man be Spirit, and Religion be rooted in the nature of that Spirit, then its roots are more everlasting than the foundations of the hills, and it is more a part of the constitution of things than if it were the framework of the visible universe. It is only a theory of Naturalism which can speak of Religion as a temporary phase of man's development; and no such theory has been able to face the fact that man could ask such questions and come to such answers as Religion puts and gives.

The necessity for Religion we here speak of, is that which is compatible with man's freedom. When man is truly and fully man, he is religious; but he is religious of his own free act. Religion cannot be a Given, cannot be imparted without self-activity and self-development, cannot be accounted for unless man be Spirit. Its necessity and its truth stand or fall with the truth of man's existence as Spirit. It is for the latter truth Religion ever stands, and, standing on this, declares that man's existence, work, and destiny are alike inexplicable apart from the existence, presence, and governing authority of an Absolute Spirit. If man's existence as Spirit, in the sense we have all along contended

for, be granted, then the facts which Religion, as a manifestation of that Spirit, has to furnish, lead one to the belief in a Spirit revealed to man's Spirit as the Absolute, the Infinite, and the Eternal. Hence it is that Self-revelation and God-revelation go hand in hand; and hence is it that the history of Religion can be viewed either as the progressive revelation to man of the nature and attributes of God, or as the progressive revelation to man of the relation in which he ought to stand to God, and how he can best effect this. We have already touched on the theory which would make Religion an effort of pure Imagination, and God an abstraction of the same mental exercise: let us here finally dispose of it. In the *first place*, we have to ask: Is Imagination here an exercise of the Spirit, apart from all other exercises: does it involve Reason, or does it not; does it imply a Spirit acting in accordance with its constitutive principles and Ideals, or does it not; can there in fact be an exercise of pure Imagination which can influence conduct and lead to self-development, or is not the conception of such an exercise an effort of pure Imagination? In the *second place*, granting God to be such an abstraction as this theory declares, we have to ask: How can man learn what the commands of such an abstraction are; how is it possible to have any truth as regards Religion between man and man; how were a rational growth or development in such a monstrous self-deception possible; how could man keep his sanity, not to speak of maintaining his pro-

gress, were he to live by faith in an abstraction of the pure Imagination? We deem it a more rational theory, one more in accordance with all the facts and all they reveal, to believe that, in matters of deepest moment, men are too much in earnest, to be the prey of mere fancies and dreams, that what helps a man towards goodness must itself be good, and that what is inseparable from man's best and noblest achievements, must be necessary to his well-being and must furnish Truth. It would be a denial of the Unity of the Spirit to assert that what excites and inspires to Goodness, cannot itself be good, or, being good, cannot be true. No account of religion which makes it the creature of fancy, of irrationality, of a particular instinct, faculty, sentiment, or mode of consciousness viewed as apart from the Life, or as not revealing the Spirit as a whole; or which would make it a temporary stage in man's evolution, can be accepted. The facts of Life, the rational development which the history of religion presents, the abiding presence in the Spirit of those necessities of thought which have ever prompted its answers and propelled its progress, its vital connection with all the manifestations, and the Unity of the Spirit,—all protest against and repudiate any such theory.

Religion, we contend, is an expression of man's Spirit. Being a manifestation of that Spirit, it will reveal it as a whole, and so will present distinctive beliefs, feelings, and practices, in every one of its forms. Since in every manifestation the

Spirit as a whole is at work, Reason, too, is at work ; and since every manifestation is an attempt to realise an Absolute Ideal, that is, to express Truth and to grasp Reality ; if Religion can be proved to be such a manifestation, it necessarily follows that it has a Truth of its own, a revelation of Reality of its own, and a distinct value and indispensable function for the Life of man. What its truths are, one must learn from the science which orders its knowledge —Theology ; it is our present purpose only to place it on the same eternal foundations as all manifestations rest on. We have now to establish our contention that Religion is a manifestation of the Spirit.

SEC. II. RELIGION AND THE TESTS OF A SPIRITUAL MANIFESTATION.

Among the tests of a Manifestation we hold the following are principal and decisive :—

1. It must have a distinct office in, and must have a value of its own for, the Life.

2. It must exhibit the Spirit as a whole.

3. It must have a spiritual experience of its own, yet an experience which colours the whole Life.

4. It must have intimate and vital relations with all other manifestations. Its progress must advance theirs, as theirs its ; and its suppression must have disastrous consequences on their growth. Its teachings must not contradict any of theirs.

5. Its forms will appear throughout the course

of History. It will be a part of man himself; and he will be unable, if he desire to progress, to shake himself rid of it.

6. It will exhibit all the characteristic marks of man's advance. It will progress with his Progress, and share in his degradation. It will itself display a rational advance, *i.e.*, a progressive movement towards the realisation of an Absolute Ideal.

7. It will exhibit forms appropriate to the different stages of such an advance; and at the present time forms differing, according to general features of men's individualities, and according to the force in them of conservative or progressive tendencies.

We hold we have not begged the question in the statement of any of these. They are not specially applicable to Religion: they are applicable to Art, Morality, Natural Science, and all other manifestations. They are drawn from all our earlier accounts of Life and of the Unity of the Spirit. No one can well deny that whatever stands these tests, must be a manifestation of the Spirit, and must furnish Truth which all men would do well to heed. If Religion can stand them, its right to be heard, its importance for life, and its claim to be a revelation of Reality, are fully established. Any demand for proofs, for its right to exist, other than these, can be made only by one ignorant of what proof in such a matter can be, and having a false notion of the nature and function of Reason. As I said before, if Religion be a manifestation of the Spirit, then Reason is at work in it; and if Reason be at

work, Truth is being sought and established. This we take to be the supreme consequence of our position. Let us now apply the tests to Religion in detail.

First Test: Religion has a distinct Office and Value for Life. Religion has to teach man what he truly is, and what is his right relation to Reality. It seeks to take from his eyes the glamour of the Material, and to give him a true insight into the meaning and purpose of Life. Only in the Spiritual, it asserts, can man find satisfaction for his heart's desires; only there can he lay up abiding treasures; his Heaven is there, his Hell is there. It declares the Material to be but the means for the advancement of the Spiritual; it cannot be greater than the agent which masters and uses it; it cannot be as high as the end for which it is used. What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and never know himself as Spirit? In the darkness of Materialism, in the wail of Pessimism, in the dissatisfaction which the mere Material engenders, it sees the assurance of its own position, and the failure of any opposite position to satisfy the Spirit which is in man. But Religion declares man to be not only Spirit, but a dependent Spirit. He did not create himself; no man could create him; he has not sprung from the Given; he knows himself to be under the government of supreme Ideals, in obedience to which he finds his chief good; and so Religion declares that Spirit can have but one source, that only a Supreme Good Spirit can so

ern the Spirits of men; and that, since these ·als are Absolute and Infinite, and since through ·m the Given everywhere—Nature itself—is ıstered, this Supreme Spirit is Absolute and finite; and that the Given, as so mastered, is but revelation of Him. Religion, therefore, affirms ıat man in knowing himself knows God, that in ·rving the ends of his being he is obeying God, ıat man, whenever he walks, is walking in the ırength he gets from God, and, whenever he walks ı the light, he is walking in the light of God. All hat man has, he owes to God; every good deed he does, every true manifestation of his Spirit, is of and through the Divine. If man makes Progress, it is towards God, and it is through the help and guidance of God. To Religion the Ideals are not abstractions; they cannot be understood apart from God; all man's acts have reference to Him; in Him man lives, and moves, and has his being. Every discovery which man makes, every advance in any manifestation, is but a further light on the Being and Nature of God; and every such advance implies a greater strength and a clearer insight placed at the disposal of man, and so an increased responsibility to serve God more perfectly, and to glorify Him in every department of his being. This revelation of God which is in and by the human Spirit, is more clearly seen by some persons than by others, and these become the prophets and religious teachers of their time. To some peoples the unfolding of it becomes the particular manifesta-

tion which their Spirits found easiest to work in, and these have been special agents for the communication of Divine truths. But no people has been destitute of the revelation, and no people has ever come to greatness to whom some particular revelation, some particular trait of the Divine Character, has not been revealed. So every individual may have his revelation; it is in his own Spirit he can see God, or nowhere; and as his individuality differs from that of all other men, so God is seen by him as no other person can ever see Him. Religion calls on man to know himself as free, and yet to know that true freedom is found only in goodness and love, and these latter only in the love and obedience of God. Religion teaches man that the truly human is the truly Divine; and that whatever hinders man in Progress, prevents him from seeing God. Against the Given everywhere, against every form of temptation, man has to fight, and has to see himself in this fight a co-worker with God. When man walks in the love and obedience of God, Life is transfigured for him, for he is transfigured; and in so far as he can win others to the same mission, in so far has he established the Kingdom of Heaven among men, which Kingdom proves itself to be Light, Liberty, Joy, and Peace.

Religion ever affirms that man cannot realise himself till he sees himself as related to God. For confirmation of this, it points both to the history of nations, and to the testimony of those, some of them the noblest and most gifted of our race, who

have sought satisfaction for their highest Ideal in something less than God, and who have come later to realise God's relation to their whole Life, and their duty to Him. Such a revelation is no matter of abstract reasoning; it can be known only through living in it; it cannot be communicated by one individual to another. But the effects of such an Experience are unmistakable, and hence is it that all forms of cultured Religions insist on a New Birth, or on that surrender of the Self to God by which man places his own will in obedience to the Divine. Other manifestations may lead man into abstractions, and may so immerse him in his own conquests that he fails to see in them the revelation of the Spiritual; but this is rarely a fault of Religion: it is ever calling on man to deal with Realities. As it compels man to regard that which gives unity and substance and permanence to his Life as Spirit, so it compels him to regard the Source and Sustainer and Guide and Governor of his Life as Spirit. Man being what he is, no other interpretation of the facts of Life will satisfy him; and this interpretation is ever confirming itself both in his theoretical and practical activities. It is Religion alone, among all the Manifestations, which speaks of God; it is it alone which declares man's relation to Him; hence its specific function in the Life. Its value is learned from what it does for man, from the mere fact that there is that in man which renders it as a manifestation necessary; and from that Character which is the supreme

manifestation of a Life lived in obedience to God. In every case it gives a secure basis to Life, in every case it completes all other manifestations, in all cases it has Reason within it, and calls on the other manifestations to behold themselves as interpreting the Supreme Reason working in all, and in every case it is willing to submit its teachings to all the tests, theoretical and practical, which decide as to Truth or Falsehood.

Second Test: Religion must manifest the Spirit as a whole. In every form of Religion we have forms of Belief, forms of Rite and Ceremony, and Feelings of Love, Fear, Awe, and Reverence, called forth by the Being revealed by the one and sought to be obeyed by the other. No definition of Religion which would make it the expression of mere Feeling, mere Knowing, or mere Will, has ever yet succeeded in doing justice to the facts of Religion. In every religious act the Spirit as a whole is present; it is with his whole being man knows, fears, loves, worships, obeys, and holds communion with, God. If a man's practice is contradictory to his profession, one or other of them is not the expression of his Religion, *i.e.*, of what at heart he thinks and is, of what he supremely loves and obeys. Religion, too, is not for a part of Life, but for the whole. It is not a pleasant shelter for rough weather; but it is a rock on which man's feet can stand, whatever the floods of Life may do. Under whatever form it comes to light, it is ever a revelation of the Spirit, and of the Spirit as a whole.

Third Test: Religion must have a Spiritual Experience of its own. Take what relevant evidence we may: the affirmation of any form of Religion, the great facts of the religious life, the utterances of prominent religious teachers, the voice of the mass of religious people, or the fact of religious worship at the present day—and there is the same testimony to the reality, uniqueness, and power of Religious Experience. How could man ever come to a belief in a God, had he not passed through a unique experience? Man grew, and as he grew and stretched out to master all things, he found that he and they alike were under the One Supreme Authority. Whence came he by that knowledge, if not through self-knowledge, self-mastery, and tested experience? How can such an act as Prayer on the part of sincere men be accounted for, if man does not in his Spirit commune with God? Is not Repentance one of the most vital, most momentous facts of Life; is not every true man reflecting continually, from day to day and from hour to hour; and what meaning has this, if God does not make His presence known to man? The preachers in all pulpits are ever appealing to a religious experience which they share with their hearers; and no more monstrous assumption can be raised than the assertion that Reason is wanting to pew and pulpit alike, and that all are self-deceived and playing at make-believe.

It is only begging the question to wave such experience aside by calling it mysterious. Every experience is mysterious. We must decide fairly as

to facts, and as to what these facts imply and reveal. No one who deals honestly with the facts of the religious Life, can reject the evidence of a Religious Experience. The next question that arises: What does this imply to make it possible? If this leads us to the belief in God, there we must go. If we deny that it is impossible for man to know God, what do we really mean? Have we not ourselves formed the conception of God and of the knowledge of Him, before we can assert this impossibility; and is not our own nature in its possibilities here contradicting our own utterance? It is surely possible for us to know God, else how is the denial of this possibility possible? How is it possible to account for the utterances of the great religious teachers, if this alleged possibility is impossible? The mere epithet, *mysterious*, tells us nothing. As we have seen so often, every act of Life is shrouded in a like mystery to that which encloses the experience by which man enters into relation, or into a new relation, with God.

Let us more fully establish the claims of Religious Experience to Reality and to Truth, by giving what the tests of Experience in general must be, and what are those specially applicable to religious experience.

General. Every experience must be a revelation of the Spirit as a whole.

Every experience must be a consciousness of work done, and of success or failure in overcoming a Given.

Every experience enters into the formation of character, and has influence throughout Life's activities.

Every experience is accompanied by faith (*i.e.*, with the belief that the Spirit can attain its Ideal in the form presented to it), and gives a new strength and dignity to the Life.

Every such experience is an enlargement of Life as a whole, and enables the Spirit to overcome all future difficulties like to that once surmounted.

If the Spirit be progressing, all its experiences are really victories, and each one indicates a higher step in the attainment of a full spiritual character through the realisation of its Ideals.

Each and every experience is a trial of the Spirit's Faith—of its faith in itself and in its Ideals.

Special. Every successive religious experience gives a clearer and fuller revelation of the character of God, and of His will for the individual.

Every successive religious experience gives to the Spirit a deeper knowledge of its own weakness in itself or apart from the Divine Spirit, and, at the same time, a more triumphant assurance in the help which Divine Omnipotence places at its disposal.

Every successive religious experience gives to the Spirit a juster conception of the hideous nature of sin, and of man's duty respecting it.

Every successive religious experience gives greater value to Life as a whole by giving greater value to the Spirit, gives a stronger Faith by bestowing a more certain knowledge of what man can accom-

plish and what is God's will for him, and gives an added grandeur and dignity to man's Work everywhere, by showing that it is along the line of God's purpose for working out the redemption and the good of man.

If Religious Experience can stand these tests, who can doubt its Truth? On the possibility of a knowledge of God, what other tests can there be beyond those given? Acknowledge man to be Spirit; acknowledge Life, Work, and the Spirit's manifestations to be what I have described them; then God must be Spirit, and being so, what other revelation can He make; or how can He be apprehended or comprehended otherwise than I have indicated? If the possibility of the knowledge of God be denied to man, how shall we account for the experience that stands all the tests here laid down?

Fourth Test: Religion must have Vital Connections with all Spiritual Manifestations. Let us see what this involves:—

Its every activity and growth is a revelation of the Spirit as a whole. This we have already seen to be true of Religion.

It cannot progress without advancing Life as a whole, and causing all manifestations to spring forth into newness of Life. The confirmation of this which History affords, is amply sufficient to establish it. Where has there been an epoch in religious history which was not the beginning of a new era for the whole Life of man? It is little wonder that Moses, Christ, and Mohammed gave

the starting-point of chronology to their respective followers; for it is by the religious changes that man can best be assured of his progress as a whole. Every religious teacher has been a great moral reformer; every religious revelation and outburst of growth have so transformed man that a transformation and reformation in Government, Law, Social Customs and Institutions have necessarily followed; and forerunning or attending such, there have been the visions of the poet and the creations of the artist to help man to realise his spiritual greatness, and to behold the glory and beauty of the new heavens and the new earth wherein righteousness dwelleth. In the end, every activity of man has been quickened into newness of Life.

No manifestation can advance without promoting the development of Religion. If all Thought, all Knowledge, and all Work spring from the Spirit of man; if that Spirit burst forth and grow in its development in distinct, yet interrelated, manifestations; and if the Unity of the Spirit in all its activities and acts be the supreme fact of facts in the Life: then if Religion be a manifestation, and only if it be so, this our present contention must be true. One can call in all the facts of Life, and all the evidence of History, in its favour. Man has never yet made progress in any sphere of work without progressing sooner or later in his conception of God, and in the conception of his relation to Him. All great epochs of Progress bear witness to this. One need note here only the influence of the Revival of Learning

and of the Rise of Modern Natural Science on the development of Religion at the time of the Reformation, the influence of the writers and poets of the Victorian era on the formation of religious thought, and the still more marked influence which the development of Natural Science and of Historical Criticism has had on views of God and of Revelation. This does not mean that the Natural Scientist, or Poet, or Moralist, as such, can teach the Theologian as such, that the view-point of any of these can be the view-point of any other, or that the fulfilment of the Ideal of any is at the same time a realisation of the Ideals of the others. Not so. If Religion has advanced, then it is the Spirit within it, working towards the Ideal of Religion, which has caused that advance. Owing to the relation Religion bears to all manifestations, its progress is partly dependent on theirs, but its progress, as theirs, is the free act of the Spirit of man striving towards that Ideal which is the guide and authority in all religious advance. It is when we see how History teaches that Religion is interwoven with the whole Life of man, that we are assured of its position as a manifestation, and of those other positions *re* the manifestations, the function and place of Reason, and the Unity of the Spirit, which we have throughout contended for.

It cannot be denied its place without loss and ultimate ruin to all manifestations. If Art, Morality, Natural Science, Government, etc., be not existences in themselves, but modes of expression by which a

Spirit, such as I have ascribed to man, attains self-development; then, if Religion be such a mode of expression, this cannot but be the case. Let us look for a moment at the View of Life on which Religion is grounded, and the place Religion itself occupies in it. This View contends that activities of man are but modes of revelation of a Spirit, and that, in each and every activity, the Spirit of man is guided in its exercise towards Truth by the presence within it of an Absolute Ideal, which points to the perfection of the attainment of that exercise, and which itself is but the revelation of a Supreme Spirit, Absolute over all Spirits. It further holds that, while each mode of activity strives after the perfection of the Spirit within its own exercise alone, and is often so absorbed in this that it never lifts its eyes to behold the Spiritual Realities revealed in it, there is one mode of activity in which the Spirit is called to self-awareness in the presence of, and in relation to, the Supreme Spirit. This mode, which is called Religion, is so related to the other modes that it must interpret their results and advances as further light into the nature and works of God. It imparts to man that faith in himself, in his guides, and in his work, without which hope and progress would be impossible; and, at the same time, sees in all his progress a means of further development towards its own Ideal. How shall man know God; how shall he indeed commune with Him; how shall he best serve Him—are some of the questions Religion seeks to answer; and it

answers them truly, only when it stands in right relation to all other Manifestations of man's Spirit. Now if this View be correct, if Religion be indeed a mode by which man's Spirit must manifest itself, and if it have these relations to other manifestations, the truth of what I here contend for is at once evident. And if History teaches that man cannot progress apart from an ever-purifying conception of God, that every great civilisation rests on a growing Religion, and that no nation has ever survived the loss or decay of its Religion, what are we to say of the nature and place of Religion? Must we not agree that these are as we have declared them to be? In discussing our present position, we must take care to guard against two errors which often prevent men from seeing its truth. The *first* is, the confounding of Religion in its root or essence with a particular form, or forms, of it. The root of Religion is the recognition of a Higher than man, which he should obey, and which he soon comes to know as Supreme Spirit. Let this recognition be in man's consciousness or his spiritual activities as a formative influence on his actions, and, whatever be the opposition he may offer to existing religious forms, he is a truly religious man. Even if he recognise this Absolute Authority in the shape of Moral Law, or an Ideal of Work, he may be more religious than many a preacher who proclaims his creed from the housetops; for the obedience he offers in his whole Life to this Authority, is ever a subjection of the Self, while the latter

may be ever exalting Self. He may not see that such an Authority is an abstraction till it is centred in a Supreme Spirit, but it is as real to him and as supreme as if he did see it so centred. If the Moral Law which he thus implicitly obeys, be in advance of the moral teaching of the religious forms he opposes, he is really serving the cause of Truth, of Religion, and of God by such opposition, and is bringing about a reformation in Morality and in Religion, though he know it not. It can be laid down that no one can cheerfully and whole-heartedly obey a Higher than himself, an Authority which is above the purest aspirations of man, and yet be opposed to Religion. Yet there is danger to the man occupying such a position who refuses to see the full implications of it, just as there are dangers to the man who, pretending to be religious, blinds his eyes to the contradictions in his beliefs and the unmoral or immoral attributes he assigns to God. For the former ere long will be tempted to see his Authority as a creation of his own, as a product of blind material forces; and may fall into all the darkness and moral degradation which such a position vitally held must ever bring. Our present point is, however, to guard against the confusion between Religion and religious forms. The *second* error to be guarded against lies in the word, *denial*. The denial spoken of above must not be a mere word-denial, but one in which the whole man is involved, and in which Religion, in form, expression, and root, is utterly rejected. Such a denial will lead to

Formalism, Idolatry, Superstition, and pure selfishness. Summing up, we can assert that no man and no people ever yet gave up the worship of, and obedience to, an Absolute Being without placing themselves in a perilous position, that no nation has ever long been able to hold by a Supreme Authority which was not rooted in an Absolute Spirit, and that neither man nor nation has ever yet denied an Absolute Authority without ending in utter degradation and ruin.

No manifestation can be denied its place, and yet Religion continue to flourish. Here, again, we must appeal to daily life and to History for confirmation. While Morality has to do with every act of Life, and has to judge Religion in so far as it fails to set itself to attain its Ideal, yet its own special sphere is ever distinct, and its own Ideal remains unique and unmistakable. Now if Religion in any of its forms seeks to repress the development of the Spirit which only Morality can give, or to hamper and confine it by shaping it according to its bidding, before long Self and selfish considerations will dominate the religious life everywhere. In chaining Morality to its forms, Religion has bound itself hand and foot to the same forms. True Religion has ever affirmed that no man can love God who loveth not his brother also, but many religious people have overlooked the necessary connection. In times of conflict, when Religion has taken on a stern temper, we have the repression or subjection of Morality, and selfishness, cruelty,

and unnatural affection assuming the garb of, and passing for, love to God. It can be well contended that, if Luther had seen and emphasised the place of Morality, there would have been fewer dissensions in the Protestant camps, and many of the bloody wars of the post-Reformation period would have been prevented. Be that as it may, History clearly establishes that Religion has ever shrivelled up and grown harsh and forbidding, when it has repressed the free growth of Morality. Art cannot be denied its place, and the Life be kept wholesome and clean, sweet and beautiful. Art, we take it, is the love and expression of Beauty everywhere, and pervades the whole Life, even as does Morality. There is a beauty of holiness in Religion, a beauty of sympathetic action in Morality, a beauty of expression in Natural Science, and a beauty in daily life which means cleanliness, order, and harmony. Religion cannot thrive amidst laziness and dirt, and cannot thrive if the fullest expression is not given to the Love of the Beautiful everywhere. When Religion has had fullest development, Art has flourished, as witness the cathedrals and temples of the world; when Religion has restrained Art, then it itself has sunk into narrow, stern, and cruel views of God. Natural Science, refused its place, means a narrowing of the conception of the Divine, and false views of Work and Progress. Where this happens, laziness is soon rampant throughout the Life, and religious progress is checked. The good people who would have us return to the hand-

looms, the sickles, and pre-telegraph communications of our ancestors, know not what they say. Logically, if we should return to an earlier stage, we ought to return to the first stage, and, clad in skin or leaves, eat our berries or half-cooked food in the caves of the rock or the thickets of the wood. Such a view denies Progress to be right, to be natural, to be Divine. In opposing Natural Science, religious people have often the latent belief that the mastery of the Material is opposed to the highest spiritual ends. Some Natural Scientists may so believe, themselves. But such a belief falls from us when we open our eyes to see Natural Science as a spiritual manifestation, and to see in it that one manifestation in which the Spirit, in our century, has proved so unmistakably its might over the Given of Matter. Nor can Religion thrive if it preach the neglect of Daily Work and of the ordinary duties of Life, or if it draw a hard-and-fast line between the secular and the sacred. Let it deny sacredness to the mother's work in the home or the labourer's toil in the fields, and immediately spiritual pride and self-conceit take possession of its forms. Life is one; it is sacred all through; whatever is done in obedience to the Ideal, is Divine. This follows from the Unity of the Spirit, and from the dependence of the Spirit which Religion teaches; and the teaching of History but enforces its truth.

Religion and the other manifestations must not conflict. That they do not, and can not, may be learned either from the presuppositions common

to all, from the relations in which it stands to the others, or from the facts of History. The main presuppositions of any and every manifestation are: a Spirit working within it, a Given to be mastered, an Absolute Ideal to be attained through this mastery, Faith in the powers of the Spirit and in the guidance of the Ideal to attain this End. Religion, like Natural Science, has all these. The Given which it has to master is threefold. *Firstly*, it has to read the revelation of the Divine which the mastery of the Given by every manifestation furnishes; it has to interpret all their results and attainments in the light of its own Ideal; *secondly*, it has to express its conception of God in the Character it is daily forming, and by every word and act of daily life; and *thirdly*, it has, by statement of its beliefs in doctrines, and by appropriate private and social acts of worship, to secure a clear knowledge of the Divine and a continual progress in that knowledge. The faith which the Natural Scientist has in his powers and in the Ideal he is ever striving to realise, is ever supported and confirmed by the results; the faith which the Religious man has in the Spirit striving towards the Religious Ideal, and in the Supreme Spirit revealed to him in it, is confirmed and strengthened in like manner. From the relations in which Religion stands to all manifestations, it can be seen they cannot oppose or contradict each other. It is their necessary complement; it does not say, it cannot say, that any of their findings is false; it simply accepts their well-

ascertained results, and then points out the deeper revelation they contain. Nor can they declare its findings to be false; they cannot stretch beyond their own spheres; Reason, working within them, cannot reach out beyond the Ideals they seek to realise; Reason, working in the sphere of Religion, cannot change their results, but it can give them a new meaning; thus, there cannot be contradiction or opposition, there can be only harmony and necessary co-working. To supplement and uphold what has here been said of the presuppositions and relations of Religion, let us note the working in its thought of the principle of Causality. This is a principle or presupposition of all reasoning, of all knowledge. It is too late in the day now for any logician of note to attempt to drive it out of Sense-Experience, as Mill did. It is in all Experience, since, being a necessity of Thought, Experience could not be framed without it; but, just because all Experience presupposes it, it is no product of the Given. It gives us as corollaries:—

Out of nothing something of itself cannot come.
Something cannot resolve itself into nothing.
The Real cannot be resolved by the Non-Real into nothing.
The Contingent cannot yield the Necessary, nor can the Non-Real produce the Real.

These corollaries are operative in all thought. The religious thinker, more clearly than the Natural Scientist, holds by a real Spirit in man and the presence in it of the Absolute and the Infinite. When

he frames the idea of Creation, of the birth of the Spirit, or of Immortality, he is but obeying these necessities of his thought. To ask the Spirit of man to think that it has arisen out of Matter, that it has made itself, that the Absolute and Infinite in all its conceptions are but the offspring of weakness, of thought, and of the dreams of Imagination; that it, through which all things are known, and in which the Infinite, the Absolute, and the Eternal dwell. is, on the death of man, resolved into the material (which it is not), or into nothing—is to ask it to commit intellectual suicide, or to contradict those necessities which make thought possible. A Natural Scientist cannot deny the necessities of his thought, nor can he deny the necessities of his Spirit, which compel him to exercise all his powers along the line of Natural Science; neither can the religious man deny the necessities which lead him to seek for God, and, having found Him, to see in all departments of life but revelations of His Nature, Mind, and Will. Reason working in each has the same presuppositions. In the domain of Natural Science, there are a special Given, and a particular End, and so the body of Knowledge is distinct; in the domain of Religion, its peculiar End and its own mode of dealing with the Given lead to a different body of Knowledge.

But does History not record conflicts between Religion and Philosophy, and between Religion and Literature, as in Ancient Greece; and has there not been an almost continual war between

Religion and Natural Science in this century? These contradictions and conflicts have arisen and raged, but they have never been between the spiritual manifestations as such, but between the Spirit in progress in one of them and the Spirit identifying itself with the Given, either of that same one, or of another. It will be enough for our present purpose if we make this clear as to the conflict between Religion and Natural Science. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the Protestant Churches drew up creeds for their adherents which were soon regarded as the final form of religious truth. Against such tyrannous limitation the growing Spirit of man in Religion protested, and proclaimed its freedom by the formation of new creeds and Churches. Ere long the traditional views incorporated in the creeds came into conflict with the discoveries of Natural Science. Religion had in olden times incorporated the views of the physical universe known to the men of the time, and had interpreted these from its own standpoint. Later times had come to regard not only the religious interpretations, but the views themselves, as religious truths. Further, as is ever the case, in the course of progress more was read into the views than their original thinkers and expounders had intended; they were ingeniously expanded or explained so as to include discoveries of later times, or changed views of the physical universe arrived at by modern Natural Science. At last, by no possible ingenuity of explanation could the old-world views of the

process of creation or of the history of nations fit in with modern discoveries; and many teachers of Religion, fettered by traditional beliefs, were unable to see that the contradiction lay, not between the religious interpretation and the scientific discoveries, but between these later and older scientific views. Blinded as to the true province of Religion, they did not see that Natural Science could not interfere, and was not interfering, with a single one of its truths, and that their duty was gratefully to accept the later discoveries, and see in them a grander view and fuller confirmation of every truth Religion had ever taught. This was, indeed, seen all the time by many leading Theologians and many leading Natural Scientists, as was most pointedly established by Professor Tait in an American Review in answer to Mr Froude; and this is what is now seen by all qualified to judge on the matter. Contradiction has never arisen between Religion as a spiritual manifestation and any other spiritual manifestation. Every contradiction which arises, is between a progressive form and a traditional one within the same sphere; and if a contradiction seems to arise between one manifestation and another, it is not really between the manifestations; it is but a call to discard old forms, to embrace new facts, and to develop and ennoble Life everywhere by a fresh interpretation and mastery of all established facts.

Fifth Test: Religion must be a universal manifestation of the Spirit of man. If Religion be, and only if it be, a manifestation of the Spirit, will it be

found wherever man is found. This does not mean that all men and all nations will exhibit it in the same way and to the same degree; it does not mean that, among different peoples, certain individuals will not be found who deny its place to Religion; but it does mean that no people is destitute of a form of Religion, that, among all peoples who are progressing, its function and influence have a great and fundamental importance accorded them, and that no individuals are found anywhere who are utterly destitute of those movements of the Spirit which are expressed in religious forms. That Religion is universal and has been one of the most marked characteristics of man's history since the beginning of his era, has now been placed, by investigators, beyond doubt. The question is at once raised: Does this universality prove that Religion springs from necessities of the Spirit of man, and that its utterances aim at Reality and Truth? To this there can be but one answer. If we see Religion marking man wherever found, supplying principles of union and cohesion to every society, characterising man in success and in failure, in progress and in degradation, changing its forms with his growth, suiting itself to the needs of his Spirit and the progressive forms of all manifestations, yet revealing along the whole line of advance a rational progress towards the attainment of an Absolute Ideal; what else, believing in the Unity of the Spirit, can we say than that it is a manifestation of the Spirit and must ever remain one?

But is this not to contend that what is universal is infallible? Not so; we contend for the Reality of the manifestation, for the Reality of the Spirit working within it, for the presence and working in it of Reason, for its necessary existence, since the Spirit of man is what it is; and not for the truth of all which has been uttered in its name, nor for the equal truth of all its forms. Religion, being but a mode in which the Spirit of man must express itself, must alter its forms as the Spirit of man grows; and must ever express that view of Reality and that Truth it has been formed to reveal. In every age of Progress it has grasped its Ideal in the form best suited for that age, and has uttered the only Truth which the minds of the time were capable of receiving. Religious truth is no more infallible than is any other form of truth; but this is not to say there is no truth in Religion. We contend that there has been no universal belief which has not expressed a conquest of the Given, and the view of Reality suitable for that particular stage of man's Progress. The very fact that it was universal, proves that it fitted into man's knowledge at the time. When such a belief has been surrendered, it has ever been only for one that better expresses the truth the former contended for. Wherever, therefore, such a progressive substitution or transformation has been going on throughout the history of the race, there man can be sure he is dealing with a spiritual manifestation, with necessities of thought and being, and with facts and views of

Reality. He is dealing with that which man cannot shake himself free of, any more than he can alter the constitution of his Spirit. In Religion we have certain beliefs, as that in God, held from the beginning, and ever abandoned in one form only to give place to another, and, if the people were advancing, a higher. We have Religion as a whole manifesting the same progressive development. What are we, then, to declare of it—that it is natural or artificial, necessary for man's Progress and Life or a device of cunning teachers, a declaration of Reality or a dream of the Unreal? There can be for those who hold by the Unity of the Spirit and the true view of Reason but one answer.

A misleading parallelism is sometimes drawn between Religion and some one discarded form of Belief, such as: The Ptolemaic system of the universe. As this universal belief was found erroneous, and had to be abandoned, so, it is contended, may it be with Religion although it is universal. There are in this specious reasoning both the confusion between a manifestation and its successive forms and a subtle *petitio principii*. It is not pointed out that the Ptolemaic system was discarded only for a better explanation, and that this change was evidence of the manifestation of Natural Science, and of the existence of a certain range of physical facts which demand some explanation. The universal belief discarded did not grasp nothingness nor arise of itself. So with any belief of Religion. Its presence and universality prove that there are

facts to be expressed, and a certain necessity to interpret them in a particular way. The change in belief neither removes the facts nor the necessity. To be a fair comparison, Religion should be compared with Natural Science, or its division, Astronomy; then it would easily be seen that, however the individual beliefs change, the manifestation of the Spirit remains. It is a begging of the question to assume that any universal belief of man has rested on any other foundation than that of solid fact; and it is a false view of Spirit which asserts that the purely artificial and factitious can remain his enduring possession, enter into the warp and woof of his Life, and maintain throughout his advance a development suited to it. When one takes all the facts of this development and all its implications into consideration, he can understand why Professor Max Müller in this connection emphasises Schiller's words: "Die Weltgeschichte is das Weltgericht"; and why he insists that the history of Religion, impartially considered, can lead to no other conclusion than that it is founded in the necessities of the Spirit and in the constitution of things, and so is ever proclaiming in its progress what Reality is, and what view of it man has now arrived at.

Sixth Test: Religion in its successive forms must display a rational advance, i.e. *the progressive movement towards the realisation of an Absolute Ideal.* The Ideal of Religion is expressed by Principal Caird in his definition of Religion, as: "The communion of man with the Divine through his every act and

word, 'the full surrender of the finite will to the Infinite Will in all things.'" Hence we should expect two things from its history: an increasing purity in the conception of God, and an increasing clearness in the recognition of His will. Most scholars agree that its history teaches these, and no one can deny them who believes in any sense in an evolution or progress in religious beliefs and forms. It has been the high privilege and special praise of Professor Max Müller to unfold this development in the Aryan Religions. But all Religions which have made progress, reveal the same necessities of thought, the same constitution of Spirit, and the same striving to know God and to enter into purer communion with Him. Whether we take the advance from Polytheism to Monotheism, the growth in the idea of sacrifice, the revelation of religious progress in recorded prayers, or the history of creeds and ceremonies, we can see the increasing spirituality, the fuller subjection of the Self, the purifying of the attributes ascribed to Deity, and the growing consciousness that Religion is not a matter of form, or a distinct and separate department of Life, but is concerned with every thought and act of man. The relation of the so-called Higher Religions to the Lower, the reformations in religious forms and beliefs made by advancing peoples, the different stages in religious progress which different Churches of modern Christendom, and different people in the same Church, occupy, and the testimony of all sincere souls who have lived the religious life, are inexplicable

on any other view than that we are now considering. All the great religious teachers ever emphasise it. Only One has walked this earth in Whom the Ideal was fully realised. To all others, even to a St Paul, a St Augustine, a Luther, or a Thomas à Kempis, the stature of the man, Christ Jesus, is ever the unattained yet the truly attainable, and that which Life is given in order to attain.

The present position is not antagonistic to the doctrines which teach that God has, at sundry times and in divers manners, revealed Himself by special revelation to the children of men. On the contrary, it is consonant with such teaching. That God reveals Himself to man, must be true, or Religion is a web of lies throughout. We have all along striven to show that man truly lives only in so far as he walks in a higher light than his own, and obeys a higher law than his own, and that he fully realises himself only when he sees in this higher light and higher law the revelation and expression of a Supreme Spirit who is Supreme Love and Supreme Goodness. When we maintain also that no prophet gained his revelation by sheer passivity or day-dreaming, but that it was granted to him because he had won it by spiritual worth and spiritual toil, and that every revelation was one fitted both to the prophet and the age to which it was given, we are but echoing the words of the great religious teachers of the day. Nor is the special doctrine of Christianity, that God revealed Himself in human flesh for man's salvation, contradictory to our

position. It really is in accord with all that we have throughout contended for. For, in this sacrifice of Himself, we have the Ideal of the Communion with God realised in One Who is bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh; and we have an answer to the demands which the Ideal of Love has ever made. The more clearly it is seen that Religion is a Spiritual Manifestation, the more clearly it is seen to be based in the necessities of man's Nature; and, to give the true completion to Life, the more evident is it that Christ came, not to destroy any religious truth, but to uphold and fulfil them all. The Christian Life as presented by Christ remains for man ever an Ideal; the Kingdom of Heaven He ushered in, is still the goal of all social and religious workers; the character He demands from His disciples, has ever to be realised and worked out by each for himself amidst new surroundings and against ever-recurring temptations. And as the centuries move on, in spite of all the efforts of the noble, the righteous, the brave, and the true, the stature of the man, Christ Jesus, remains the unattained, though still the inspiring, Religious Ideal of the race.

☞ *Seventh Test: The forms of Religion will vary from age to age, and, in every age and among great peoples, will exhibit differences corresponding to different types of individualities, and so will reveal stages or degrees of Truth and successive and varying modes of viewing Reality.* If Religion be a manifestation of the Spirit, and only if it be, from all

we have learned of Progress, this variation in its forms will be among the great facts of Life. That they are so varied, is so evident, that the fact is often urged against Religion as a proof that there is no Truth in it. Were Religion the Truth of God, it is argued, it would exhibit one unvarying form and teach one eternal truth. This argument rests on a false view of the Spirit, of Truth, and of Religion. It asserts that Religion could be a formation and comprehension of the Spirit, yet would not share in its progressive Life; it is to demand for Religion eternal rest and stagnation, whilst in all other departments of man's thought and activity he moves on to wider views of Truth and more glorious attainments. Besides, Religion is Truth embodied in a character; how can such a Truth remain the same from age to age and from man to man, seeing that the problems of Life are ever changing, the evils to be attacked have new forms, and the endowments and circumstances of each man's Life are so different from those of any other? If Religion be a manifestation of the Spirit, Truth in it, as in all manifestations, must be progressive; if it were to preserve an unchanging form, it would be something apart from, and unintelligible to, the mind of man. Religion as living truth, as the expression of a man's Spirit, as the grasp which a man has taken of the revelation of God, must take to itself forms corresponding to the individuality living in and forming it.

The arguments advanced in the different parts

of this section do not rest on a fallacy: they are not a repeated inference from the assertion of the Consequent to that of the Antecedent. The Argument is not: If Religion be a spiritual manifestation, so and so will be the case; but so and so is the case, therefore Religion is a spiritual manifestation; but it is: ONLY if Religion be a spiritual manifestation can it exhibit certain characteristics; it does exhibit these, therefore it is a spiritual manifestation. Opponents must convincingly show that these characteristics are compatible with another explanation.

Further confirmation of our whole position from History. It is sometimes contended that Religion has nothing to do with the cause of man's elevation or fall, and that it is indeed only the effect of one or other of these. Religion has not produced our civilisation, it is our civilisation which has produced Christianity, is one form of this argument. It, however, rests on the fallacy of hypostatising an abstraction; Religion and Civilisation are both used as if they were entities in themselves. It is in man's Spirit we must seek for those causes and movements which give rise to both; there we must find the only real causes at work, and there shall we find the reasons for the wrongs and shame, the justice and the glory, which the history of Religion, as of Civilisation, bears witness to. It is, indeed, when we see that Religion has shared in all man's glory and all his degradation, that we see that, in it, man's progress is secured only by his free act and

his own strenuous toil, and that Religion is rooted where Life itself is rooted. Turn to History as we may, and fairly question it, and its witness to our position stands sure. Let us ask it: Has there ever been a flourishing community which has had either no Religion or a decaying form of it; or has there ever been a decaying community in which a vigorous, growing Religion was at work? Or this further question: Has there ever been a nation which, satisfied with its form of Religion and refusing to make progressive changes in it, has not ere long begun to decay, and continued to decay so long as the established forms were unreasoningly and superstitiously held to; or which, if it has been able simply to maintain its Religious Life at the level reached by its ancestors and believed to be the highest attainable, has not remained at the same dead level of attainment in all departments alike? Or this more vital one: Has there ever been a great civilisation which did not rest on, and have in its heart, a correspondingly great and lofty form of Religion? And to each and all, History answers: There has been no such phenomenon. History establishes that a pure and growing Society, as a pure and growing Life, can rest only on a religious root which is ever growing up into a larger and stronger religious system, and that no Society has ever yet rested on Atheism, or for any length of time on a decaying Religion. It is in this proof of History, in the evidence of a moral order which Society must obey if it is to endure, in the course "of a stream of

tendency, of a continuous not-ourselves which makes for righteousness," that man has ever found the most convincing proofs of the existence of God, been able to rise to a knowledge of His attributes, and been enabled to gather proofs of His Omnipotence, Omniscience, and marvellous Wisdom in guiding and governing the doings of men, so that His own high ends are ever realised, while allowing them the full use of their freedom.

The ceaseless criticism which History shows has ever been at work in the formation, acceptance, and transmission of religious beliefs, is one of the strongest proofs of our position. We have already shown that it is the testimony of everyday experience that no generation accepts the beliefs of its fathers, tacitly and unquestioningly; and it is the testimony of History, that, in the individual mind and in the successive minds of a Society, beliefs are changing with the growth of the minds forming and embracing them, and that the more progressive the people, the more scrutinising and thorough is the criticism which old traditional beliefs must undergo before acceptance, and the more rapid the transformation they pass through in the individual minds. When the Unity of the Spirit is comprehended, when we see the rightful place of Reason in the Life, and when we see that nothing artificial and nothing contrary to the necessities of the Spirit can long find lodging among its beliefs, we begin to understand the force of the argument, that the beliefs which have survived the vicissitudes of man's changing career, which

have grown with his growth and withered with his decay, and which have been the outpouring and expression of his Spirit in spite of the criticism of the developments of other manifestations, and of an immanent criticism within, point to necessities in man's Spirit, and therefore belong to and reveal whatever is most Real. One must either believe this or believe that in religious history we have Reason doing the work of Unreason or Misreason, and that the bulk of mankind have been in their religious beliefs both fools and liars. To anyone holding the right view of the Unity of the Spirit, endeavouring to give the full significance to this unceasing criticism and growth, and knowing the character which religious beliefs have ever been associated with, the latter alternative is impossible.

SEC. III. CONCLUDING REMARKS.

Religion and Intuition. From all which has now been said, it will be more clearly seen that we were right in affirming that self-knowledge ever, rightly understood, is God-knowledge. Nay, is not the knowledge of anything, if seen in its entirety, but a form of God-knowledge? We cannot master that which is utterly unknown to us and beyond our power of knowing; an Unknowable God is a contradiction in terms. In the judgment passed on ourselves or others, there is implied an absolute standard implicit in our consciousness. This standard becomes more explicit the higher we rise in the scale of char-

acter; but it is ever absolute. Now the only absolute standard of Character, or of Spirits seeking perfection of development, can be a Supreme Spirit who is in fulness all that the Spirits aim at in Character. No abstraction, or mere idea, could be such a standard; such by itself is a mere Given. Nothing but Spirit can judge Spirit; nothing but Spirit can know and guide Spirit; nothing but Spirit can influence Spirit for good; nothing but a Spirit who is Absolute Wisdom, Absolute Righteousness, and Absolute Love, can so control the Spirits of men, that obedience to its demands brings strength, growth, enlightenment, goodness, and love; no abstract beliefs, no mere theories, no bowing down to an abstraction or vast void, can form Character and enable a man to trample on Self; if God be not, no worship or attitude of obedience would give any new meaning to Life, or strengthen the Spirit to meet and overcome the daily temptations; if God be not, all worship is deception, is at best but a species of day-dreaming; but neither deception nor day-dreaming can build Character, or can impart a spirit of purity, of love, and of active opposition to wrong and evil: when religious intuition is unfolded in its logical construction, these and such as these are the presuppositions or principles on which its argument rests. I do not know that it has ever been shown that they are opposed to Experience, Facts of Life, Reason, Truth, or Reality. Man cannot come to a real and true knowledge of himself before a mental abstraction of his own creation; no false reasonings,

no artificial postulates, can put him on the lines of the fundamental laws of Character and of Society; the View of Life and the Character which enable man both satisfactorily to explain and fully to attain the Ideals of Truth and Goodness, and to put Life and Society on sure and lasting foundations, must be in accordance with Ultimate Reality; nor can we believe that, in the most serious issues of Life, men are either deceivers or are being deceived. When a man sees himself in his weakness, or in his sins, he is then most truly himself, most truly honest and sincere; he is then desirous of knowing himself, of knowing Reality, and of getting strength to raise himself out of his weakness and his sins. That he does truly see himself as he is, and as he can be, and also sees God as Maker, Supporter, Deliverer, and Sanctifier, are truths Religion has ever stood for. These are facts, or there are no facts in Life; they are evidenced in every way such facts can be manifested and known. A transforming power to goodness and a self-sacrificing Life for our fellows' good, do not spring from dreams. We may give up believing in anything, if we cannot believe that the lives of the best men and women are moulded according to Reality, and that in all they say and do they are striving to express Truth.

When Life unfolds in its Reality, when all its works stand clear in the light which has judged and is judging them, then man knows that he is not alone, that in every act he stands before his God, and that he cannot escape the All-seeing Eye, be he in Heaven,

or Earth, or Sheol. Thus has it ever been: the good man who most truly sees himself, is he who has ever known God best. The conception of God is not, then, purely anthropomorphic; as truly can one declare the true revelation of man to himself to be theomorphic. The man who knows himself in the light of Conscience, of the Ideals, of an Absolute Authority, can no more create his God than he can create himself. If he speak truly when he declares what he himself is, then as truly does he declare what the nature of God is. This Intuition of God is no effort of Imagination, it is no act of mere Intellect. The Spirit of man can never be pictured in Imagination, nor can it be symbolically rendered; yet it is the ever-present, ever-existent fact in Experience. Only through its acts, its manifestations, its hopes, fears, strivings, can we know what it is and what it strives for. The Spirit, when living for its true ends, reveals itself through its conquest of, and mastery over, the Given; and in His absolute mastery over All That Is and over all Spirits, God is revealed. There can be no other revelation, there needs no other, save a revelation of Himself in human perfection and saving love, and that Christianity declares has been given. But the other revelation is for all men, in all Spirits, makes all other revelations comprehensible, and thus is it that Religion is universal and must remain so. Let us not whittle this revelation away by translating it over into logical forms, and then by taking these for the whole parts. Let us not surrender fundamental facts because we find it diffi-

cult to express them in language, or in other than metaphorical terms. Intuition is no greater mystery than reasoning or perception; rather, as Professor Max Müller has shown, it is the last, the greatest mystery.

Now we see more clearly what was meant by the assertion that religious people do not get their Religion by mere thinking, and have not to wait for their beliefs till the theologians have settled all the knotty problems in Theology. A man does not refuse food till he knows all the laws of Physiology; he does not wait before reasoning till he has learned all the laws of thought: he thinks, and acts, and lives first. In no other way could he arrive at any knowledge of the demands of his Ideals, of the laws of his being, of Reality, or of any ground of certainty. A man by acting and living comes to know how he ought to live, and why he ought so to live. Thus he comes to the knowledge of God. No mere reasoning can reach God; no reasoning, apart from that intuition of the Spirit, which reveals both itself and Him, can enable a man to find Him. To say, without making necessary reservations, that a man should distrust his intuitions, is to declare that he should distrust self-knowledge of all kinds. Only the intuitions which do not lead to a clearer light, a greater strength, a clearer view of the ends of Life and the way to attain them, should be distrusted. The intuitions which lead to mere day-dreaming are phantasms. But the light which transfigures Life, which reveals man's possible greatness to him,

which shows him God by his side, and which infuses faith, courage, and strength into his Spirit, is no *ignis fatuus*, but a true light from Heaven. The whole Life afterwards attests its truth, and bears witness to the Reality it has disclosed.

Religion and Theology. Theology, as we have seen, is but the disclosure of the reasonableness of Religion, of the logic immanent in its whole development. It arises out of the activity and Life of the Spirit in Religion; it is but the thought-interpretation of this; and has no reasoning apart from it and the ends striven for. That there are contradictions among theologians, is not a sign of weakness but of strength, not of falsity but of truth; it proves that there is growth, and that no adequate form has been found to express it. Were there no growth, all might rest content with one form. All growing manifestations exhibit the same phenomenon. Thus do we learn that Truth is progressive, that doctrines and creeds must grow from age to age, that religious forms must alter with the growing Life; and yet the continuity teaches us that the same Ideal has ever been striven for, and that man from age to age has to face and conquer the same temptations. Hence, too, we see that Religion in its essence is not intellectual belief, nor reverential feeling, nor ritual, nor liturgy, but a Life of the Spirit expressing itself in all these ways, and making them all and much else possible. It is this Life which should be kept growing; and attention should be paid to creed and rite only in so far as they are helpful to this end.